

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico is still pending.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I offer as an amendment a proviso to come in at the end of section 6, page 7, a new amendment, which I ask may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has not been disposed of; that amendment is pending.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator may offer his amendment, so that it may be printed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My amendment is already printed. I understand I am not in order, then, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is an amendment pending.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to present an amendment for printing and to lie on the table, which I intend to propose to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. SWANSON. If any other Senators have amendments to offer, I shall be glad to have them offer them now.

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to offer an amendment, to be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In justice to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. New], the Chair will say that on the statement of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], that he would conclude in about 10 minutes, the Chair said to the Senator from Indiana, if he wanted to introduce an amendment, it might be introduced to-morrow.

Mr. SWANSON. There is no purpose to preclude the introduction of any amendment; that can be done at any time; but it is simply desired to have the amendments printed. My purpose is now to ask that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Will the Senator allow me to offer an amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I have drawn the amendment very hastily, simply as a basis for an idea, and I may want to modify it somewhat to-morrow. I should like, however, to have it printed and stated by the Secretary as I have drawn it, so that it will be in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 5, page 6, it is proposed to add the following:

Such property shall be sold as soon after the conclusion of the war as it can be advantageously done.

Mr. SWANSON. I think there is a purpose to have an executive session for a few minutes. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Virginia asks that at not later than 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to bring to the attention of those Senators present that to-night at 8 o'clock, in the House Office Building, on the third floor, in the majority assembly room, there will be a lecture upon what has been done for wounded soldiers in the line of rehabilitation, and also pictures. All Senators and their friends are invited.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30, 1918.

CONSUL.

CLASS 8.

Parker W. Buhrman to be a consul of class 8.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William H. Edley to be receiver of public moneys at Lander, Wyo.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Orvil L. Larson, Thatcher.

CALIFORNIA.

Mary A. Dempsey, Colusa.

COLORADO.

Clinton E. Mason, La Salle.

CONNECTICUT.

Walfred C. Carlson, Washington Depot.

IDAHO.

Avery G. Constant, Buhl.

Paul Disney, Rupert.

MAINE.

Stanwood M. Rose, East Machias.

MISSISSIPPI.

Robert B. Cox, Batesville.

Rueben Lafayette Beal, Monticello.

MONTANA.

Charles H. Baker, Big Sandy.

NEW JERSEY.

Eva H. Ketcham, Belvidere.

OKLAHOMA.

William H. Bell, Pryor.

OREGON.

Charles M. Crittenden, Hubbard.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Eva L. Fagan, Campobello.

TEXAS.

William C. Blake, Jasper.

VERMONT.

Herbert H. Beeman, Milton.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Mary W. Scott, Gary.

Lon E. Browning, Logan.

Edward E. Reyburn, Virvan.

WISCONSIN.

Mattie M. Wilson, Belleville.

Wayne W. Beggs, Cameron.

Ferdinand A. Nierode, Grafton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 30, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God Almighty, move Thou upon our hearts with all Thy quickening power, lest in the crucial test, through which the world is passing, we forget.

Increase and multiply our faith in Thee and the eternal truths Thou hast ordained, that we may be true to our convictions; that right, not might, will prevail; religion, not materialism; civilization, not barbarism; democracy, not autocracy; liberty, not oppression.

Uphold our allies in their brave struggle; increase our Army and Navy, that we may be a potent factor with them in establishing justice, peace, righteousness in all the world; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as in heaven.

Hear us in the name of the world's great Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, be excused for to-day on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks that his colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] be excused to-day on account of illness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN SEAMEN.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the Record on the subject of American seamen.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks leave to extend his remarks on the subject of American seamen. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CAPSTICK.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House set aside Sunday, May 19, for addresses on the life, character, and public services of my late colleague, JOHN H. CAPSTICK, late a Representative from New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that Sunday, May 19, be set apart for memorial services to his late colleague, Mr. CAPSTICK. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3771. An act authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government.

THE RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of April 26 appear remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. This speech appears in the RECORD of April 29, the same except with some minor corrections. I assume that the gentleman would not be averse to having the first print of the speech go out of the RECORD.

Mr. HEFLIN. The first print should go out. I do not know how it happened, but it has happened twice in succession in the Printing Office that my speeches have not been correctly printed, and the mistakes of the Printing Office have made me appear to say things that I did not say. In the second print of this speech the Government Printing Office inserted an entire page of manuscript which was left out in the first print.

Mr. GILLETTE. How long after the speech was delivered was it printed the first time?

Mr. HEFLIN. It was made on April 5, and I left the city that night to make some speeches in favor of the liberty loan, and did not get back until about the 20th of the month. The speech was not printed until Friday morning.

Mr. GILLETTE. The gentleman waited three weeks, and then had it printed wrong.

Mr. HEFLIN. I corrected the mistake here as soon as I discovered it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Did not the gentleman correct it before it went to the Printing Office the first time?

Mr. HEFLIN. The Printing Office left out an entire page of typewritten manuscript, page 2 of the speech.

Mr. GILLETTE. It is a little extraordinary that these things happen to the gentleman and to no one else.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think so, too. There must be a pro-German in the Government Printing Office. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the first print will go out.

There was no objection.

REHABILITATION OF DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak not exceeding two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to speak not exceeding two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, there is being held a joint hearing by the Senate Committee on Education and the House Committee on Education on the bill (H. R. 11367) for the rehabilitation of disabled soldiers. To-night at 8 o'clock in the majority room of the House Office Building there will be given a lecture with moving pictures illustrating what has been accomplished by Canada for the purpose of taking care of disabled soldiers. I sincerely trust the Members of the House will be present and that they will bring their wives with them. This is a very important bill, a war measure, and a hearty invitation is extended to each and every Member to be present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for 30 days, not for the purpose of attending to any business, not on account of sickness, but I want to open my campaign in Georgia for the United States Senate [applause], and I hope that my friends on both sides will be liberal enough to grant this request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for 30 days' leave of absence to run for Senator. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINERALS AND METALS FOR WAR PURPOSES.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11259) to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of those ores, metals, and minerals which have formerly been largely imported or of which there is or may be an inadequate supply.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 11259, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 17. That the sum of \$500,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until June 30, 1919, for the payment of all expenses of carrying out the provisions of this act, including personal services, traveling, and subsistence expenses, the payment for rent, the purchase of equipment, supplies, postage, printing, publications, and such other articles, both in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem essential.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 18, line 4, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Illinois a question. Does he not think it would be wise to insert in this section 17, in line 11, an amendment that would authorize the payment of the cost of explorations out of the \$500,000 fund appropriated? It is intended to go into the public land of the United States, according to the amendment offered yesterday by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], authorizing explorations into Government lands, and make examination for the existence of these precious minerals. There is no provision in this bill covering that special service which is now put in by the amendment which was inserted authorizing such examinations into the public domain and was not in the original bill. I ask the gentleman if he does not think that ought to be covered and allowed by an amendment now inserted?

Mr. FOSTER. No; and I will tell the gentleman why. There is a fund now appropriated by Congress in the last deficiency appropriation bill, I think, providing for the appropriation of \$150,000 for doing that very work, and it would only add to that, and I do not believe that it is necessary to put it in here.

Mr. ROBBINS. I presume the gentleman refers to the testimony of Dr. Manning, found on page 68 of the hearings, in which he says that the Bureau of Mines has \$150,000 recently given by Congress and an item of \$100,000 more from July 1 last, which will enable that bureau to gather valuable information concerning mineral resources by the use of this \$250,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what the gentleman had reference to.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is that the fund that the gentleman refers to?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is to explore; to find out what we have.

Mr. ROBBINS. I raise the question now because of the amendment inserted by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] permitting the exploration of Government lands, and I want to know whether this fund, to which Dr. Manning refers in his testimony, amounting now to \$250,000, is intended to cover that? If it is, I shall not offer any amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought under that allowance that they could do that work.

Mr. ROBBINS. If they can not do it, then this bill ought to be amended to permit them to do so; but if that covers this situation, I shall not offer the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there is no doubt that they can.

Mr. ROBBINS. With that information I shall not offer the amendment I otherwise would offer.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of reaching some definite position I stated early in the consideration of this bill that at the proper time I would offer an amendment reducing the amount of the general appropriation from \$500,000 to \$10,000,000. I notice that the sum of \$500,000 is carried here in excess of the \$50,000,000. In other words, the entire appropriation for the consummation of this measure will be \$50,500,000. On page 33 of the hearings Dr. Smith or Mr. Baruch comments on the fact that there is \$150,000 carried in the deficiency appropriation bill, allowed for extra investigations, which have heretofore not been made by the Department of the Interior, and the prospective allowance of \$100,000 for

the coming year, which in the aggregate would make \$250,000. That supplemented by this allowance of \$500,000, if this bill is passed in the terms which it now carries, would give the Department of the Interior \$750,000 for the purpose of making the investigation and carrying out the administrative policy of this measure. I move to strike out the sum of "\$500,000," in line 4, page 18, and to insert "\$250,000." My purpose is quite apparent. With the \$150,000 already carried in the deficiency appropriation bill, and the \$100,000 to be carried next year, making \$250,000, added to the \$250,000 that I propose, will make the \$500,000 proposed in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I do not care to have any more time on this amendment, but I would like to have a little more time on the amendment reducing the amount in the next section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 4, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$250,000."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, this is only an authorization for an appropriation. When the bill was originally drafted it provided \$1,000,000 for the administration of the law. After the committee had gone through the original bill and had changed the location from an indefinite one, in which the President would appoint some administrator of the bill, it was placed in the hands of the Department of the Interior; it was then thought that with the organization which they had there and which could be utilized, the appropriation could be reduced one-half. It was accordingly cut down from one million to five hundred thousand.

Of course, as the committee understands, this \$500,000 is not an appropriation at this time, but the Appropriations Committee later would take up the matter and determine after hearings, I take it, as they have always done heretofore these propositions and give what is necessary.

I do not know, and of course I can not tell, what it will cost to administer the bill, but from talking with the men who were before us and who would probably have the administration of the bill if it goes into the Department of the Interior, up to July 1, 1919, they would probably require this much money to carry out the provisions of the bill and do the work efficiently. That is the reason we left it. It is only an authorization and does not make an appropriation. For that reason I would rather that it would not be cut down to \$250,000.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have read the hearings carefully. If this bill has a pressing need for adoption, I want to find it. I have not been yet able to find anywhere in the hearings any statement indicating that \$500,000 is necessary or is an advisable amount to be devoted to the administration of the bill.

Mr. FOSTER. When the committee spent two or three days in considering the bill the men connected with the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and the War Mineral Board were before us, and this matter was talked over. It does not appear in the hearings. The original amount that the bill proposed of \$1,000,000, after discussing the matter fully and after the bill had been changed, placing it in the hands of the Interior Department, that amount was cut down to \$500,000. It was their judgment that it would probably require that amount of money. Of course they will make their showing before the Committee on Appropriations as to what ought to be done.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is not proposed under this bill to create another new bureau or a new head of a bureau?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. It simply extends the bureau in the Interior Department?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt, if it becomes a law and goes into the Interior Department, that it will be administered by the Geological Survey or the Bureau of Mines by those men now in the department.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is not the purpose of the bill to create another new activity?

Mr. FOSTER. No. The men that are employed there now are employed under appropriations for doing other work. Of course, they can not do this work and that work, too, which they are now doing.

Mr. McKENZIE. So they must have additional help?

Mr. FOSTER. They are bound to, in order to administer the law.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What is the character of this expense to be?

Mr. FOSTER. The employment of men in connection with the guarantee of price of material. They will have to have men to look after that and men, probably, to look after the different producers throughout the United States and to see that the law is not violated.

Mr. GORDON. Would it be part of the administration of the law to grubstake a man to go out and look for minerals?

Mr. FOSTER. Not one penny goes for that purpose.

Mr. GORDON. Five hundred thousand dollars would hire a good many experts.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is right about that, but that is not the intention, and it will not be done. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Scott].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, after line 13, insert the following:

"The maximum salary to be paid under the provisions of this act shall not exceed the rate of \$4,500 per annum for any scientific, technological, or administrative service, and shall not exceed the rate of \$1,800 per annum for any clerical or other subordinate service."

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is in harmony with the present law in reference to the employment of scientific men in the Agricultural Department out of a lump sum and the other departments of the Government that have lump sums out of which they employ people of this character. I will state for the benefit of the committee that I understand those having charge of the bill have no objection to this amendment. Eighteen hundred dollars is also the highest price paid to class 4 employees under the civil service. So this gives the administration the leeway that they are entitled to, and the only limitation is on the top salaries paid to employees.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I do.

Mr. CANNON. Is there any limitation now affecting the \$4,500 men?

Mr. Sisson. None in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. If the scientific people who are interested and have been interested for years under similar appropriations begin to educate young men in colleges to make them competent and put college professors on the salary roll—oh, the gentleman will recollect the scandals there were about that a few years ago—is there any limitation now upon the expenditures of this fund along that line?

Mr. Sisson. Well, I will state there is no limitation in the bill now. That is my purpose in offering this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. But as to the number of people—

Mr. Sisson. As I understand, the practical operation of this bill will be that when the department shall organize it will be necessary then that they come to the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of getting money to carry this law into operation. That being true, in the organization of its affairs I thought it well enough to let the gentlemen in charge of the operations of the bill under the Bureau of Mines know that the same limitations were upon them under this bill that are now on the Secretary of Agriculture in the employment of like services.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not seek by his amendment the authorization to limit the number of experts to 20, 40, 100, or 200?

Mr. Sisson. No; I state frankly that I have no idea in the world as to the number it will take. If I knew the number that could reasonably perform the service, I should be very glad to put it in the amendment.

Mr. HAMLIN. When the Appropriations Committee comes to consider the appropriating the money, would that committee go into that phase of it?

Mr. Sisson. That is my judgment about it, and they then would have to demonstrate to the Committee on Appropriations the need for every man that they employ. The only limitation that they would be under here would be the employment of any of these men to get together their preliminary organization, and they could not employ for a year and put on the pay roll any man at more than \$4,500.

Mr. CANNON. I understand.

Mr. Sisson. Of course, it does not mean every man would get \$4,500; and after they present their pay roll to the Committee on Appropriations, their salary roll to that committee, the limitation here would prevent them from entering into any negotiations with anybody for more than \$4,500.

Mr. CANNON. But I understand that the gentleman recollects, if the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. That some years ago one of the fiercest contests I ever witnessed in this House under the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations—and I recollect at that time that Mr. Tawney, I believe, was the chairman—was to cut off an abuse that originated in the Department of Agriculture, I believe, in the Forestry Service, where they absolutely were paying the expenses of students in one or more State universities to be educated so that they might be capable in forestry.

Mr. SISSON. And the gentleman will recollect at that time some of the employees were getting enormous salaries.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. And that brought about a limitation on the Agricultural bill, limiting the employment of these technological and scientific men to \$4,500 and the only purpose of this amendment, and the chairman of the committee and those in charge of the bill, as I understand, have no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection in the world to the gentleman offering the amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This makes an authorization of \$500,000, and it is a very broad one, for the payment of all the expenses of carrying out the provisions of this act, including personal services, traveling and subsistence expenses, the payment of rent, printing publications and such other articles, and so forth. Why, under this it would be lawful to run an advertising campaign, have publications, and such things have been done. I do not want it done as a war measure. Now, again. It says here for rent. Why, the Interior Department has just moved into that magnificent building, the most roomy public building in the United States if not in the world. The Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines are lodged there. Are they going to build some more public buildings? Is that contemplated?

Mr. FOSTER. May I say to my colleague, if he will yield—

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say this, that the Department of the Interior has a new building, went into it the latter part of last year or the first of this. That building is now filled up, and I will say there is also a part of the War Department, as I understand, in that building now.

Mr. CANNON. Which is soon to go out.

Mr. FOSTER. If it does, it will make room, but we do not know whether they will have to have quarters outside or not. They may have to have them, probably will be compelled on account of being filled up.

Mr. CANNON. I trust not. This payment for rent would allow in San Francisco, in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, or anywhere else the payment of rent, and it is simply wonderful, and I speak of them respectfully, of what the scientists and the alleged scientists—and there are some alleged scientists who are not scientists—how industrious they are to get upon the pay roll, and they want to have things, and many of them want to travel.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, that may be so.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; that is so.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether it is all so or not.

Mr. CANNON. I think I will just move, in order to test the sense of the House, to strike out "rent."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. Does the gentleman withdraw his pro forma amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. On page 18, line 9, after the word "expenses," strike out the words, in lines 9 and 10, "payment for rent."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON: Page 18, line 9, after the word "expenses," strike out "the payment for rent."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word. I hope the committee will not strike this out. This same provision was in the explosive bill, but it was not used. I think we can wisely trust to the Secretary of the Interior in this matter, to the end that if he has not sufficient room down there in the department to place these people who will have to do this work, that he ought to have that right to place them somewhere else, and it will be passed on by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] on the Appropriations Committee. It might be necessary to rent a building some place, and I am sure we can trust the Secretary. We did it under the explosive bill, and he never paid a cent for rent. So I think the discretion will be wisely placed.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. The Federal Vocational Board is operating under a law that carried an annual appropriation of \$200,000, and they thought it included the privilege of rental; but it did not, and for a year nearly the Federal Vocational Board had been compelled to pay it out of their own pockets, because they could not find quarters, up until recently, when the deficiency bill allowed the amount to reimburse them for what they had paid out.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember that.

Mr. FESS. It caused considerable distress, not only individually, but inefficient effort on the part of the board.

Mr. CANNON. Well, if the gentleman will allow me—and I do not care about applying for recognition again—the gentleman knows and I know, and I think every other Member of this House knows, that no man ever lived that could go outside of everything that is being done and that the President is charged with being responsible for, being the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He must pick out people to do the work. No man ever occupied the position of Secretary of the Interior, I do not care how able he was—and what I am going to say is more true now, two or three fold, than ever heretofore—that could get outside of all the details of these various industries. He must trust somebody. Well, whom does he trust? Why, he trusts the Bureau of Mines, he trusts the Geological Survey, and God knows how many more people he does trust. He has to trust somebody. Now, I think it proper to call the gentleman's attention to that fact, because I apprehend that there will be a great many thousands of dollars asked for the payment of rent.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that is correct. I do not think there is going to be any great force under this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. That for the purposes of this act the sum of \$50,000,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available as a revolving fund during the time this act is in effect: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purposes described in the preceding section: *Provided further*, That itemized statements covering all purchases and disbursements under this and the preceding section shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives on or before the 25th day of each month after the taking effect of this act, covering the business of the preceding month, and said statements shall be subject to public inspection.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

On page 18, line 15, after the word "hereby," insert the words "authorized to be."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: On line 15, page 18, strike out the figures "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 18, line 15, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have carefully studied this bill and the hearings on it and I do not think it has been shown that \$50,000,000 is necessary to effectuate the purposes of it. During the discussion that we have had on the bill by members of the committee I believe that very good reasons have been advanced for the development in this country of an adequate supply of the ores and the metals enumerated in this bill, and that it is probably necessary to do so as a war measure in the manner provided for in this bill. But while I believe that a good case has been made out in that respect I do not believe that the members of the committee have anywhere demonstrated that \$50,000,000 is necessary to effectuate that purpose, but that, on the contrary, much less than that sum will be sufficient to answer the purposes at this time.

If my memory serves me correctly, the expenses of carrying on the war have now reached the enormous total of more than \$1,000,000,000 a month, and I submit that that is a very large amount of money, and is a scale of expenditures which is bound to eventually tax the sufficiency of the resources of a country even as rich as the United States. And while I am sure that Congress and the President and all of the executive departments of the Government will endeavor to keep these enormous expenses from further expanding in every proper way that they can, still I am sure that, in spite of all that can be done, these expenses will continue to grow. They will increase be-

cause our proper war activities will continue to expand as the war progresses. Therefore I think that the responsibility rests upon Congress in the exercise of its constitutional duties to keep down these appropriations wherever it can properly be done and without hindering and obstructing our war preparations in any way whatever. I think that the present measure is one of those cases where some scaling down of the appropriation can properly be done, and that is why I have offered my amendment.

Now, in reading the report of the committee, in reading the testimony of Secretary Lane, in reading the testimony of other gentlemen who have testified in the hearings, I do not see where it has anywhere been demonstrated that \$50,000,000 is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act. The fund is a revolving fund. And after the act goes into effect, if it is demonstrated that it is practical, if it is demonstrated that an adequate supply of these metals and ores can be obtained here in the United States, why Congress will still be in session, and if the Secretary of the Interior thinks that more money is necessary to carry on the work, I am sure that Congress will be ready and willing to authorize the appropriation. Congress has been very prompt and willing to vote all the needed appropriations, and I am sure that it will not manifest any contrary disposition in the future; therefore, I think that at this time we ought not to authorize a greater appropriation for this purpose than \$10,000,000. That is why I have offered the amendment. I have no desire whatever to cripple the bill or impair the effectuating of its purpose. My only desire is to keep down appropriations to real necessities in order that the resources of the country may prove adequate to meet the great strain of the war.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two on my own responsibility in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. I stated in general debate here in relation to this matter that I did not know whether they were going to need \$10,000,000, \$25,000,000, \$50,000,000, or \$100,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this law, if it becomes a law.

I can conceive that if the operation should remain normal in a way—that is, that the ore might be mined, these minerals secured, and flow directly to the places of consumption—the Government perhaps would not have to use any of this money. On the other hand I can conceive of a condition that might arise where it will be necessary for the Government to protect its guarantee by the purchase and the storage and the holding and afterwards selling of a large amount of this material; and in that event it would require undoubtedly \$50,000,000 and maybe \$100,000,000. So I say that it is utterly impossible for us to know accurately how much money is going to be needed.

Now, men who are familiar with these things, as much so as men can be—and I refer to the experts in the Bureau of Mines and in the Geological Survey, and geologists throughout the country, men who use and consume these minerals—they have told us that they thought it would be safe to say \$50,000,000 would or might be needed, and I do not know of any better authority than those men upon that proposition.

Now, one thing I would say to my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK], and I know he is perfectly sincere and would not withhold a penny that the Government would need in order to effectuate this law—that this is not an appropriation but is only an authorization. It may be that when the matter comes before the Committee on Appropriations progress will have been made to the extent that a better and more accurate conclusion as to the amount may be reached. I am not wedded to the amount.

This is the view I take of it: If there is any use for the passage of this bill at all, it is because it deals with war necessities, and I think it does, and very vitally so. Then if that be true we ought not to hamper or handicap or embarrass the administration in the execution of this law by withholding from them the necessary amount of money to carry on the operations.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HAMLIN. So I say I believe we ought to trust, that we will make no mistake in trusting, the men who are just as patriotic as we are and very much better advised than we are in the question of the amount we ought to authorize. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that there is no authorization for the use of this revolving fund except that contained in section 11. Section 11 provides for the purchase and the storing and the resale of these various mineral necessities, so that it is not for the purpose of purchase, and the \$50,000,000 revolving fund can not be used for the purpose of purchasing supplies for the Government. I noticed in reading the hearings that nearly all of these

men, in referring to the amount necessary being \$50,000,000, continually, as you will see by their testimony, have in mind the fact of the purchases on the part of the Government. Now, the Government is not going to purchase these things, except in this way: Appropriations will be made from the various departments for the purchase. This bill does not provide for the purchase of a dollar's worth of property by the Government. It only authorizes the purchase of these things, for the storing of them, and the reselling of them out of this revolving fund. Now, if that be true, it certainly seems to me that the amount is grossly excessive, and that certainly \$10,000,000 would be ample for the purpose.

Mr. HAMLIN. Section 14, of course, does provide for the purchase of materials.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; but not out of the revolving fund.

Mr. HAMLIN. The bill provides that the Government may guarantee a minimum price. Then, it provides that the Government purchase outright, and it provides for requisitioning and taking over these materials.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was up last week I stated to the committee that at the proper time I would present an amendment reducing the amount of the appropriation. I had no particular interest or pride in introducing such an amendment, and I am very glad it has been presented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]. The argument—that is, the one that seems to present the most force in the minds of the committee in opposition to reducing any appropriation in the bill—is that the Committee on Appropriations will ultimately pass upon such appropriation.

There may be some force in that position, and I was willing to yield to it in regard to the previous section; but I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is bound to be guided and governed by the action of the House in Committee of the Whole. If the Committee of the Whole places the appropriation in this bill at \$50,000,000, the Committee on Appropriations is bound to recognize the action of this House.

Let me call the attention of the committee to another fact. A great many men in this House have at some previous time sat in other legislative bodies. I do not believe that any man who has had that experience has ever seen a bureau or department of government, whether it be State or Nation, which did not expend to the very limit of the appropriation. That is human. It is a fault, but it is a human fault, which seems not to be avoidable.

If this House appropriates \$50,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this bill, you can be sure that every penny of the \$50,000,000 will be expended. If it is necessary to have \$50,000,000 after they get into the operation of this bill, as was very aptly stated by a gentleman on that side of the House, this Congress will be in session and the temper of this House has often been expressed; if it is necessary to make the appropriation, this House will get together, as it did on the naval appropriation bill, and spend \$140,000,000 an hour without a dissenting vote and without an argument. Therefore the committee may have no fear if it can come before this House or the Committee of the Whole and show a case, that this House will not gladly respond; but I think it is folly to place in an appropriation bill an amount of money that, according to the undivided statements of the committee itself, is purely speculative and arbitrary.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], striking out "\$50,000,000" and inserting "\$25,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute.

Mr. COX. I am offering it as an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Cox: Line 15, page 18, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, of course I do not know how much money will be needed to administer this bill. I do feel, however, that a \$50,000,000 authorization is an exorbitant amount. I feel that it is far too much, and I indorse every statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT], that while the Committee on Appropriations is not bound by an authorization, yet if this bill becomes a law, authorizing the expenditure of \$50,000,000 to administer it, for some reason, by some excuse, in some way or some manner, somehow those charged with its responsibility will find a way to come before the Appropriations Committee and get the full amount authorized in the bill. I wonder if it is not time this Congress, to some extent at least, should begin to lay its hands upon the purse strings of the Treasury of the United States? This may be an important bill in some respects. In fact, it

may be to some extent a necessity; but I feel assured of this, and I think each one of you feel assured that as this war progresses from year to year, if it can be demonstrated to Congress that \$25,000,000 is not enough to administer this bill, Congress will be willing and anxious to appropriate whatever may be necessary. But the point I desire to make is this, not to put in this bill an authorization of \$50,000,000, because if you do it will be spent whether necessary or not, whether it will yield back to this Government 100 cents on the dollar or not, or whether it will yield back anything, and here is an opportunity to begin to teach somebody in the various bureaus down the Avenue that Congress to some extent is going to lay its hands upon the purse strings of the Treasury, and not yield to the insistent demands of the departments for not alone a million dollars, but millions on top of millions. I am very much afraid this war is going on for some time. We do not know yet how much we have got into it, but if this war goes on for three or four years more, where is the money coming from with which to finance it?

The time will come before long when the people will have invested all of their liquid capital in bonds and but one other source will be left, and that will be taxation. Now, I hope that my amendment will carry. I believe that an authorization of \$25,000,000 is sufficient. I believe it will serve notice upon those charged with the responsibility of administering it that they must use it economically; that this money must not be spent in the building up here in the city of Washington of tremendous bureaus, with hundreds, yes, thousands, of employees here in the city of Washington and elsewhere, with exorbitant salaries, trooping over the country, drawing salaries with their transportation paid.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has offered a substitute at \$25,000,000. Will the vote come upon that first?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, suppose the gentleman's substitute is defeated, what then? Under certain circumstances I would be for his amendment. I think \$25,000,000 is better than \$50,000,000.

Mr. COX. That is what I think.

Mr. CANNON. But why could we not vote on the \$10,000,000 proposition first? I think \$10,000,000 is enough.

Mr. COX. It may be.

Mr. CANNON. If that is voted down, then we could vote on the \$25,000,000 proposition.

Mr. GORDON. Let us vote on the \$10,000,000 proposition first.

Mr. COX. I was afraid the Committee of the Whole would not adopt the \$10,000,000 amendment, feeling that perchance it might be too small a sum, and so out of an abundance of caution I have offered my amendment for \$25,000,000. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says, \$25,000,000 is better than \$50,000,000.

Mr. TOWNER rose and was recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the gentleman from Iowa begins, I wonder if we could agree on time on this section and all amendments thereto? I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hardly think that is enough for all gentlemen who wish to speak.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think the gentleman will save time if he lets the debate proceed.

Mr. FOSTER. I withdraw the request for the present.

Mr. TOWNER. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he will consider a request for unanimous consent that the vote be taken first on the \$10,000,000 proposition?

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to do that. Frankly, I will say that \$10,000,000 is entirely too small an amount to do anything with. Now, if it comes to \$25,000,000, that is a different proposition.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. CANNON. If the \$25,000,000 proposition is voted down, being a substitute, then we could vote on the \$10,000,000 proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. I should fight the \$10,000,000 proposition very hard.

Mr. CANNON. If that is voted down, I suppose we could vote on \$12,000,000.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the proper way would be to vote on the smallest amount first, and then on the other.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, if this is to be taken out of my time, I decline to yield further.

Mr. CANNON. Not in the gentleman's time—a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. What was the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox]?

The CHAIRMAN. He offered a substitute.

Mr. Sisson. He offered it as a substitute, and then withdrew that and said he offered it as an amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman from Indiana were to withdraw his amendment or substitute, or whatever he cares to call it, and the vote was taken on the Black amendment and defeated, could he not offer it as an amendment to the \$50,000,000 sum?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized for five minutes from this time.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure there is no man on the floor who would not vote for \$50,000,000, or any sum that might be necessary, for the successful prosecution of the war. The only question here is whether in forming this revolving fund, which is for the purpose of purchasing and storing commodities that are named in the bill, \$50,000,000 is not an amount altogether too large. It occurs to me in reading the hearings before the committee that no such amount can possibly be used; that \$50,000,000 is only an invitation to people to go out and use it, draw on it for the purpose of developing wildcat projects, projects not now in existence, and that it will be a temptation for squandering and losing the money. Ten million dollars, and certainly \$25,000,000, will be an abundant fund for the purchase of anything that is necessary to be stored or accumulated for use in this war and then resold. The very idea of a revolving fund implies not only the purchase of commodities but the sale of them. This would mean the purchase of property and the resale of it. I think it is an unwise thing to put into the bill an amount for that purpose as great as \$50,000,000.

I do not think there is any man here that would for a minute believe that it could be used unless it was used for speculative purposes. I have gone somewhat carefully through the various things enumerated in the bill and the testimony in regard to them. There are only two articles that you might say in this bill are imperatively necessary, which we could not produce. Take ferromanganese, the testimony is unequivocal that in a short time we can produce ferromanganese, because it is already in existence. We have an abundance of sulphur and pyrites for the manufacture of sulphuric acid. Not one single dollar is necessary, in my judgment, to secure an abundant supply of pyrites and sulphur for sulphuric acid. We have the most tremendous deposit of sulphur known in the world in Louisiana and Texas. The sulphur of Louisiana is 98 per cent pure, and there is no such deposit anywhere else in the known world. We do not need a single dollar to develop that. All that is necessary is that the price should be sufficient to make development attractive. The power is given so that the Government can do it if it is necessary. So these things do not require nearly that amount of money.

In reading the hearings it is taken into consideration that \$50,000,000 shall be used for the purchase of articles the Government needs, but that is not contemplated by the bill. This is not an appropriation bill. The appropriation will have to be made by the Committee on Appropriations. I want to call the attention of gentlemen to the fact that they heard the statement made by the chairman of the Appropriation Committee, Mr. SHERLEY, on the floor regarding this very bill. He said that if this authorization were made the Appropriations Committee would feel under obligations to follow out the action of the House and make the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss whether this authorization ought to be \$50,000,000, \$25,000,000, or \$10,000,000, but I want to discuss matters incidental to that question. The issue here is, as I understand it, what the authorization should be in dollars and cents. It does seem to me that gentlemen should be able to discuss that without making remarks that necessarily reflect upon high officials of our Government. I do not believe that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] was accurate, or the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] was accurate, or the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] was accurate, when they said that inevitably whatever amount is authorized will be spent. I am sure they are right in making the statement that it is likely to be spent. Congress has this responsibility, but I doubt the propriety of gentlemen

who come in here and stand for the integrity of their bills, and vote to appropriate salaries for thousands and thousands and thousands of clerks not authorized by existing law but requested by bureaus, and then denounce the administration of the affairs of this Republic at this particular time for its prodigality, waste, and practical oppression of the people.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman is mistaken in the statement he has just made. The statute fixes the clerks of class 1, class 2, class 3, and class 4, and other officials, so that any number of clerks can be appropriated for so far as a point of order is concerned.

Mr. RUCKER. I recognize the accuracy of the gentleman's remark, but it is left for the Appropriation Committee to determine the number of clerks required and needed in these classes.

Mr. CANNON. The House determines the class, and they can increase or decrease.

Mr. RUCKER. The House may vote down a bill entirely, but gentlemen come here with very large increases in number of clerks, and then in the cloakroom these same gentlemen have sometimes said—not in committee—that the departments are going wild in their demands for clerks and that it ought to be stopped, and I think they are right about that. Yet they bring in their bills and ask the House to vote for so many clerks, and then the same gentlemen complain they can not get through the corridors of these massive buildings in Washington on account of the horde of clerks. I have recently returned from my home State, and I was surprised to hear of the number of people who expected to come to Washington in the very near future in response to examinations held by the Civil Service Commission for places in the various departments. My notion about it is that sometimes unintentionally gentlemen are guilty of making extravagant statements on the floor of this House that are as unpatriotic as statements which have landed other men behind the bars, and I think in this hour of peril, in this abnormal time, when new conditions confront us, conditions never dreamed of by men before, that it is unbecoming—and I am not trying to lecture the House—for gentlemen to stand up here and publish to the world the recklessness with which the Government of the United States is extracting money from the people and expending it with a prodigal hand. If we are spending too much, we ought to stop it, but we ought not to make the appropriation and then denounce the men who expend it for doing the very thing we authorized and invited them to do. As to this matter I can not tell. My judgment is that \$50,000,000 is too high, and I am inclined to think \$10,000,000 is enough and probably as much as ought to be expended.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend particularly the closing words of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] when he said that we ought not to make these great big appropriations and afterwards complain because the money is expended. Yet that is what we have been doing right along. Then we complain because the money was paid out, when as a matter of fact we ought to censure ourselves for ever having made the appropriations to begin with, not knowing what the money was going to be expended for. That is the trouble now. We do not know what this money is going to be expended for. Gentlemen on the other side who have the bill in charge do not know what this money is to be expended for. In some respects that is not to be wondered at, because they are starting out a new bureau, and they can not be entirely certain about the methods which will have to be pursued in carrying out the purposes of the bill, but it is very clear to me that we ought not to go any farther in this way than can be avoided. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] was right when he said a moment ago that we would soon arrive at a time when we would wonder where all the money is going to come from. I want to tell the House as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that we have reached that point now. We are wondering where the money is going to come from, and it ought to give us pause right here and on this bill. How is the liberty loan coming? It is not all subscribed yet. It is not strange that it is not all subscribed, considering the enormous amount that is required. Of course, it will be subscribed. I know that, but there will have to be another loan, and our financial difficulties will increase with each month of the war, and we can not be too careful about making appropriations not absolutely necessary.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. In answer to the question as to the liberty loan, my opinion is that the farmers of this country are going to subscribe more than \$3,000,000,000. All through the country,

blooming as it is with the finest prospect of a crop that the world ever knew, the farmers are subscribing liberally.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, yes; my own State went over the top first of all, and my district went over the top, far beyond it. Every county in my district subscribed from three to four times its allotment. That is very true, but we have got to have an immense amount of money more in another year. We have had an unfortunate experience, a very unfortunate experience, which ought to warn us as to how this matter will result. We appropriated altogether very nearly \$1,000,000,000 for aircraft production? Where has that money gone? Is there any gentleman on this floor who can tell me where it has gone and what has been done with it? Can he explain in any reasonable way what we have to show for it? No one either on this floor or on the floor at the other end of the Capitol can answer that question. We have built only one or two battle planes, and we do not know where the money has gone.

I want it to be understood that I am not now criticizing so much those who expended the money as I am criticizing ourselves for appropriating the money, not knowing what was going to be done with it, and not directing how it should be spent. That is how the trouble came about. It comes right back here to us, and we have to think about it in these times. If we continue in this sort of way we will never be able to finance this war. We must get down to some reasonable basis. If the committee will tell us how much they must have for their immediate requirements we will vote it without a minute's hesitation. If they come in at some future day and say that they have spent so much and tell us how they spent it and that they want more money for another purpose, we will vote it, and it will not take us 10 minutes to do it.

Mr. FESS. Is it not true that coming in without specifying the needs is getting us into an attitude of mind where no matter what they bring in—and they might just as well brought in \$150,000,000 as not—where we feel we must not inquire, because it is in the interest of war. I think that is a very serious situation.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is quite correct. If they would ask \$100,000,000 on this bill we would have been just as able to explain it as to explain why it was \$50,000,000.

But, Mr. Chairman, some day we will have to explain why we voted away these great sums without knowing what was going to be done with the money. The excuse will not be accepted that we were told it was for war purposes. The people will say, and say rightly, that we ought to have known how the money was going to be spent or fixed the manner of the expenditure in the bill.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been trying in the best way I could ever since this session of Congress to get the House to stop, look, and listen, and to utter a word of warning against the wanton and extravagant waste of the financial resources of this country, but as yet it does not seem as if anyone has been able to set a brake. We can not slow down or stop it at all. Now, this war has resolved itself into a question of exhaustion, an exhaustion of men and an exhaustion of money. The question on the western front to-day as it presents itself to the world is, Who has the most men and the greatest number of reserves? That is one side of the war; that is one of the important sides. The other question is, What country or what side involved has the greatest resources to finance this war? And there is where this proposition ought to come home to us. If the allies are going to win this war as the result of having funds with which to finance it, then that necessarily means we must slow down in our expenditures. There is an economical phase of this war situation that does not seem to grip the country at all, and it has not gripped the Congress in any sense whatever. All a man needs to do is to get up here and say we are the richest country in the world, and the appropriation asked for is voted. You can vote \$100,000,000 or a billion dollars simply by some man getting up on the floor and saying, "Oh, we are the richest country in the world," and up goes a billion dollars.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. A billion dollars?

Mr. HELM. A billion dollars. Just that kind of broad, naked, unsupported statement. Now, my good friend from Missouri is not altogether correct in the statement he made on this floor. The Congress is not altogether to blame for some of the abuses that he referred to. There are no more enterprising men in the United States Government than the heads of some of these bureaus, and I will extend it to some of the heads of the departments, and I will go this far, that if there is not an awakening soon in some of these departments these expenditures are going to go to such an extent that it will be something in the nature of a scandal. If you have ever had one of these bureau chiefs before your committee he wants the utmost dollar that can

possibly be put through the committee. He is not overburdened with modesty about his request and his demands. It seems to be a kind of a foot race; more particularly a horse race, and a "2-0" race at that, between them. They all want to have the biggest number of employees in their bureau, and they all want them to have the highest salary, and if they can hear of some other clerk in some other bureau that is getting a little bit more than some clerk in their bureau is getting, they want their clerk to get the highest dollar that any other clerk gets. Now, that is not an exaggerated statement, because I have had some experience in a bill which I have been trying as chairman of a committee to prepare. Instead of there being a feeling on the part of these bureau chiefs that they ought to save and spend this money economically the idea seems to be how much they can spend in the individual bureau. I am for this \$10,000,000, and if that is voted down I am going to vote for the \$25,000,000 proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not fix a time to close debate. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I have two minutes of that?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will limit his request to this amendment I will have no objection; but it may be that other amendments might be offered to the section.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want any time on this amendment? That is the only thing—if men keep on offering amendment after amendment here, it might take us all day, and I am trying to close up this bill. If the gentleman wants five minutes, I will agree to that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Well, depending upon the result of this vote is whether I shall offer an amendment or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose I save the gentleman five minutes?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman asks that debate on this amendment be limited, I have no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask that debate close on this amendment. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want time on this particular amendment?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; on this particular proposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that debate on this amendment close in seven minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have two minutes and I would like to have five.

Mr. CANNON. On the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. FOSTER. And the gentleman from Texas—the ten million and twenty-five million.

Mr. CANNON. Both or one?

Mr. FOSTER. They are practically one.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COX. If I should obtain unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I offered to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, would that preclude me from reoffering my amendment in the event the amendment of the gentleman from Texas should be voted down?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment and obtains that consent, it would be as if the amendment was never offered.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that is the very question I wanted to speak upon.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to vote for the \$10,000,000 amendment, but if the gentleman does not withdraw the \$25,000,000 amendment there may be no opportunity to do it. Is the gentleman going to withdraw the \$25,000,000 amendment?

Mr. COX. For the time being, so as to allow the committee to have a direct vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMLIN. My parliamentary inquiry is, Did I understand the Chair to hold that if the gentleman from Indiana withdraws his amendment, and the vote being had, and the proposition of the gentleman from Texas should be adopted, that the gentleman then would have the right to offer his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did not propound that inquiry.

Mr. COX. I understood that to be that if the proposition of the gentleman from Texas should be voted down, I would have the right to reoffer my amendment. I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] making the amount \$25,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAMLIN to the amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent that at the termination of seven minutes debate on the pending amendment shall close. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] one question. At whose suggestion was the amount fixed at \$50,000,000?

Mr. FOSTER. It was fixed by the department, by the men who first drew the bill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What department? The Treasury?

Mr. FOSTER. It was the war-minerals committee and the Bureau of Mines and men connected with the Geological Survey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that debate close in seven minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the question of the amount was raised during the earlier discussion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] said then substantially what he says now, except that it appeared then that this \$50,000,000 was the suggestion of Mr. Baruch, Mr. Hoover, and of the Secretary of the department, Mr. Lane. But, as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] very well and very truthfully says, the tendency in all the departments to-day is to reach out for power and more power, money and more money. The question frequently arises here whether Congress ought not to put a stop to it, whether there should not be an exercise of power here indicating that we do not propose to permit bureau or department chiefs to run this race to mulct the Treasury of the United States.

I want to vote for the \$10,000,000 proposition first, because I believe that is enough to experiment with. And that is all we are going to do in this instance. We are going to experiment in prospecting, in the matter of hunting mines and minerals, sending men into the forests and fields, and over arid territory, to find what has already been located by the Geological Survey.

Now, what are we going to do on this proposition? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] offered a substitute for \$25,000,000, which would have forced a vote on that first, and given us no opportunity to vote for \$10,000,000, but he withdrew it, and instantly the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] renewed it as an amendment to the \$10,000,000 amendment, compelling us again to vote for \$25,000,000 first. The way to treat this thing, if you want to treat it independently, is to vote down the \$25,000,000 amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, and show that you are going to have something to say about this business yourselves as Members of Congress. If you vote it down you will then have an opportunity to vote for the \$10,000,000. I believe the \$10,000,000 is sufficient to start these prospecting experiments, and this sending of men here, there, and yonder to find something new for the department to do. There is no politics in this suggestion. It is a business proposition on which Congress should exercise its own judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania evidently does not understand the bill or does not know what he is talking about. He says that this \$10,000,000 is for an experimentation, for sending men out to explore the forests, and explore hither and thither, in order to locate these minerals. Now, that is not the fact at all. This \$50,000,000 as provided in this bill is for the working capital of this organization. Now, I do not know—nobody else knows—just the amount that it will take. This goes before the Appropriations Committee, and they will look up the subject and determine what amount, as best they can, ought to be appropriated. When the affairs of this organization shall be wound up, when the war closes, every dollar, in all probability, of this money will be returned to the Treasury. There may be a little less or there may be a little more than the original amount. But it is not to be fooled away, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania says. It is simply the working capital of this organization.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman refer to section 12, where you provide going out into territory—

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman does not know the bill and does not know what is wanted.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I call the gentleman's attention to section 12.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman does not know just what is in the bill or he would not have made the statement on the floor of the House that this was for the purpose of going out and exploring mines, because the bill expressly provides that none of this money can be used except for the purpose I have mentioned. Now, that is a fact. My good friend from Pennsylvania is usually right, but in this case he is wrong.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I recur to section 12.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman has not read it and does not know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this appropriation provides storage facilities and purchase of necessities, if it shall become necessary, and to sell them again, so as to make this revolving fund needed here. I do not know what amount will be necessary. Nobody on earth can tell the exact amount that will be necessary. These men placed it at \$50,000,000 when they considered what might happen to be done under this bill. It may happen to be much more. They may come back to Congress and say that \$50,000,000 is not sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act. I realize that Congress does not like to make these large appropriations. And I have done this: When the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] offered his amendment to cut this to \$25,000,000 I had not any serious objection to it, and I do not have now. I think it is all right if we do that, because I believe if it is necessary to secure another appropriation, and they can show they have rightly expended this money, Congress will make the appropriation.

Now, I ask you in all fairness, gentlemen, not to vote for a \$10,000,000 proposition. It is not sufficient money. It is not sufficient to go out and do this work, and I ask you not to do that. I am sincere about it, as sincere as I can be.

I want to impress upon you the importance of carrying out the purposes of this act and securing this material, if it shall be necessary; and if you make it \$25,000,000 and it should be necessary to secure more money, I believe the Committee on Appropriations, with the approval of Congress, would make that appropriation. But I do most earnestly hope, gentlemen, that you will not vote for this amendment. It is not enough. Any man can go over this proposition and see that we could not secure enough of these things to get along with \$10,000,000.

This money is not to be thrown away. It is simply the working capital of this organization, and it will go back to the Treasury again; but there may be times when it will require much more than \$10,000,000, or much more than \$25,000,000, to carry on this work. The money is not to be squandered. If it were, you should hesitate with reference to it. So I hope that this \$10,000,000 will not be voted, but that the one making it \$25,000,000 will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

Mr. CANNON. Is this the \$25,000,000 proposition?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the \$25,000,000 proposition.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 41.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. HAMLIN and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 54, noes 55.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now comes up on the \$10,000,000 proposition.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been exhausted on this paragraph by agreement. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes 34.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 19. That employment under the provisions of this act shall not exempt any person from military service under the provisions of the selective-draft law approved May 18, 1917.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the subject of ferromanganese, a subject not mentioned in the pending paragraph. I desire to proceed for not more than five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes on the subject of ferromanganese. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as I have read this bill and looked over the report of the hearings and heard the arguments advanced in the debate, especially some of the statements concerning ferromanganese, I was reminded of the debate here in 1913 on the Underwood tariff bill, and of a dialogue I then had with a gentleman, a very distinguished Member of the House from Pennsylvania, now occupying a high position in the executive department of the Government, the Hon. A. Mitchell Palmer. Mr. Palmer was making a speech, he then being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. This dialogue may perhaps reveal to gentlemen the importance of the bill now before us, and the good judgment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] when he declared a few minutes ago that \$10,000,000 would not suffice to accomplish the bill's legitimate purposes. I agreed with the gentleman from Illinois and voted for the \$25,000,000 amendment.

Here is the dialogue with Mr. Palmer:

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Steel Trust make all the ferromanganese it uses? I understand it does.

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

They were proposing a tariff on ferromanganese.

Mr. COOPER. Then the trust would pay no tariff on ferromanganese, but the independent iron manufacturer would.

Mr. PALMER. I have said that.

Mr. COOPER. I did not hear the gentleman say it.

Mr. PALMER. I said exactly that, that there is no ferromanganese made in this country for sale. The steel and iron corporation makes ferromanganese for its own use, and all other producers of steel and iron buy ferromanganese from abroad.

That statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the home of the Steel Trust, may enlighten gentlemen as to the wisdom of enacting the pending bill into law. For if we can not import from other countries because of lack of shipping, then, of course, it becomes of paramount importance that we shall make ferromanganese in this country in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of manufacturers and of the Government, for, as we are informed, the Steel Trust, the vast producer and user of steel and iron, makes its own ferromanganese, and does not sell any of it, and all other producers of steel and iron must import ferromanganese.

Then the dialogue with Mr. Palmer continued:

When the Payne law was written they had ferromanganese at even a higher rate than this.

Mr. COOPER. Then, if the gentleman will permit an interruption—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. If the Steel Trust makes its own ferromanganese and does not import any, and all the other manufacturers, the little fellows, do import it, the Steel Trust will not pay this duty, but the small manufacturers will. Will not that be the situation?

Mr. PALMER. Well, we can not write a law that will make everybody pay a duty at the customhouse.

Mr. COOPER. But we are expected to write a law that will not discriminate in favor of the trust and against the independent producers.

I invite particular attention, Mr. Chairman, to that dialogue, and especially to the statement of Mr. Palmer, that the Steel Trust—by far the greatest in the world—makes its own ferromanganese and sells none, and that the small men have to import it.

Ferromanganese is absolutely necessary in the manufacture of steel. But if shipping is interfered with and imports prevented, it necessarily follows that we should at once do something to help supply ferromanganese, or the materials to make it, for the small man. This argument makes clear why I voted for \$25,000,000 instead of \$10,000,000, which, in my judgment, is an amount altogether insufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] be extended two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. The United States Steel Corporation, I am informed, produces 60 per cent of the steel and iron in the United States. So, according to the gentleman's statement, it makes six-tenths of the ferromanganese. I do not believe it makes that much. That is all I want to say.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will kindly permit me, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that I quoted what Mr. Palmer, a recognized expert, and one of the country's leading Democrats, said in 1913 in open debate on this floor during the consideration of the Underwood tariff bill.

Here are his words:

There is no ferromanganese made in this country for sale. The steel and iron corporation makes ferromanganese for its own use, and all other producers of steel and iron buy ferromanganese from abroad.

By the words "steel and iron corporation" he means what we call the Steel Trust.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will allow me, I will say that, notwithstanding the high admiration I have for the beauty and the intellect of our former colleague, Mr. Palmer, I feel quite sure that he was not very reliably informed when he made that statement while the Underwood tariff bill was being framed here from a free-trade standpoint. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield now?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman refresh the recollection of Members as to who the Mr. Palmer is who made this interesting statement? Is that the same Mr. Palmer who was a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. A leader of the Democracy of Pennsylvania?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And now the Alien Property Custodian of the United States by appointment of President Wilson?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am glad that, at last, I have convinced the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to the identity of this Mr. Palmer. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. That the President shall cause a detailed report to be made to the Congress on the 1st day of January each year of all proceedings had under this act during the year preceding. Such report shall, in addition to other matters, contain an account of all persons appointed or employed, the salary or compensation paid or allowed each, the aggregate amount of the different kinds of property purchased or requisitioned, the use and disposition made of such property, and a statement of all receipts, payments, and expenditures, together with a statement showing the general character and estimated value of all property then on hand and the aggregate amount and character of all claims against the United States growing out of this act.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Sisson: Amend, on page 19, line 8, by striking out, after the word "day," the words "of January each year" and inserting the words "of each regular session."

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to make a detailed explanation of the reason for offering this amendment. Congress meets in December, and all reports of this character are always transmitted on or before the first day of the session.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is right, and I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, if I may be granted just a word further on this manganese question, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], entirely unintentionally, gave the House a somewhat wrong impression as to the conditions that prevailed at the time of the passage of the Underwood bill. Under the Payne law there was a tariff of \$2.50 a ton on ferromanganese, but manganese ore was free from duty. Ferromanganese ore came into this country in large quantities and was smelted by the United States Steel Corporation. Consequently it made, through its smelters, nearly all the ferromanganese in the country, and it would not have made any difference with that situation whether the tariff

was on or off. The Steel Corporation would still have done the smelting, because it was the only concern having smelters to carry on that manufacture. Now, unless I misunderstand the purpose of the bill, vast and extensive as are its powers, it is not intended at this time that the United States Government will go into the business of smelting manganese ore, although in one section power is given to take over undeveloped smelters. So the Steel Corporation will still go on making nearly all the ferromanganese that is made in this country unless the Government not only takes the undeveloped smelters, but the developed smelters of the Steel Trust or builds smelters itself and operates them. I do not find any power to do either in the bill. Apparently, these powers were overlooked, or they would have been put in the bill by the bureau chiefs who framed it. In any event, there is nothing in the bill that will tend to relieve the bill from the exactions of the Steel Trust, and if there was it would require no great amount of money as long as the Government does not go into the business itself and only uses the funds for the purpose of stimulating the industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That words used in this act shall be construed to import the plural or the singular, as the case demands. The word "person" wherever used in this act shall include individuals, partnerships, associations, and corporations. When construing and enforcing the provisions of this act, the act, omission, or failure, of any official, agent, or other person acting for or employed by any partnership, association, or corporation within the scope of his employment or office shall, in every case, also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such partnership, association, or corporation as well as that of the person.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN], I have only this to say: Manufacturers of prominence in my section of the country—and there are some great manufacturers of agricultural implements—complain of the very high prices of steel. They consider some of these prices as exorbitant. Of course, as an inevitable consequence of the high price of steel the farmers pay a correspondingly high price for the implements necessary to cultivate the farms and produce the food for the people and the soldiers. Remembering these facts, and looking through this bill, I have thought that back of it, possibly, was a purpose to devise a means by which certain things absolutely essential to the production of steel and other war necessities should be made more plentiful and available than they are to-day, and thus perhaps help to protect manufacturers and the Government from being held up.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is now imported annually only about \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 worth of manganese and manganese ore, the greater portion of which is taken by the Steel Trust, so that I do not see the necessity of a very great amount of money for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Suppose that as a result of the enactment of this bill into law there should be developed in this country great quantities of manganese, and that out of that ore there should be manufactured great quantities of ferromanganese. Inevitably it would give the smaller men a better chance than they have to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 23. That the provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect after the existing state of war between the United States and Germany shall have terminated, and the fact and date of such termination shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President, as soon as in his judgment the agencies and activities herein provided for can be reasonably terminated; but the termination of this act shall not affect any act done, or any right or obligation accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil case before the said termination pursuant to this act; but all rights and liabilities under this act arising before its termination shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if the act had not terminated. Any offense committed and all penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred prior to such termination may be prosecuted or punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been terminated.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, line 14, after the number "23," strike out down to and including the word "act," in line 20, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That the provisions of this act shall cease to be in effect at the end of six months after the existing state of war between the United States and Germany and between the United States and Austria-Hungary, and the fact and date of such termination shall be ascertained and proclaimed by the President; but the termination of this act shall not affect the exercise of such authority and power herein granted as shall be necessary to speedily wind up the affairs of any enterprise already entered upon or to carry out any guaranty or contract pursuant to the terms thereof, and such termination."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was agreed to as a part of the bill, and I have no objection to it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana who introduced this amendment, which I understand is accepted by the gentleman from Illinois, whether there is any limitation whatever as to the acts done by the department or any agency thereof during the period of the war?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. A specific limitation upon any contract is contained in the provision that no contracts will be entered into after the termination of the war. There is also a specific provision that there shall be no guaranty for a greater period than two years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow me to state what is in my mind in regard to this amendment and this section? In the war-corporation bill it was provided that all business should terminate in a period of 10 years. That was the substance of the provision. There must be an end of the contract; there must be a limitation somewhere. You propose by your amendment now to have this mining business quit six months after the war rather than immediately after the war, as the section recites. During the pendency of the war, however, contracts may be made for a longer period, unless I am misinformed. I want to find out whether the committee has put a limitation upon the department for such business as originates during the pendency of the war.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will pardon me, section 11 provides that contracts shall not be for a longer term than two years.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. I think I have in mind the point of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the business thus created during the war may run on indefinitely unless some limitation is fixed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does not the provision mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] cover that, the provision in section 11?

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Here is the provision in section 11, page 10:

That the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President, is authorized from time to time to use the funds provided under section 18 to enter into contracts for necessities for periods of not exceeding two years, to purchase, to store, to provide storage facilities for, and to sell necessities at reasonable prices to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the President.

There is a specific limitation on contracts for necessities. I presume the gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind the entering into some sort of agreement where, for instance, they take over an idle plant.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; for in section 2 the President is "authorized to enter into any voluntary arrangement or agreements." Under that he might do anything under the sun.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. There is no specific limitation on the exercise of any of these powers which might extend for a period of time, except the specific provision in section 11. However, I think the provision in the amendment I have offered—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is an after-the-war proposition. The damage may be done during the pendency of the war.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. In the event that the executive department should undertake to carry this on permanently—for instance, in the taking over of an idle mine—all of that could be reached, if there was an abuse of the spirit of the law, by a subsequent Congress which will have the power to repeal or amend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will discuss this matter, I will be satisfied. I do not know whether we can correct it now, in view of the state of mind the House is in, but I want to call attention to it, because I hope that in another body there will be some limitation over and above what appears to be the limit in this bill, so that a department or a bureau can not make contracts during the pendency of the war that will run on forever.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not intend to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON. By the very terms of the bill those contracts could only be for the period of the war, because the bill applies only during the period of the war, and, under the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS], for

six months thereafter, except for the purpose of closing up any enterprise which may have been entered on, and except for the purpose of suits arising out of rights acquired during the war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course you are providing now, and that is proper, that no contracts shall be entered into after the war. That stops business from that point of view; but in section 23, the last section of the bill, it is provided, from line 20, that while the business is to cease after the war "the termination of this act shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued" during the pendency of the war. During the pendency of the war you have the right to do anything under the sun, and you may make an arrangement or obligation to run as long as you please. I say there ought to be some limitation as to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee automatically rises under the rule.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11259 and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. GARLAND. To make a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it up.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMLIN. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania opposed to the bill?

Mr. GARLAND. I am for the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there anybody here opposed to the bill who wants to offer a motion to recommit? If so, the Chair will recognize him; if not, he will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARLAND moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Mines and Mining, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following instructions: Strike out, after the word "empowered," in line 18, page 16, the words "to fix the prices of necessities wherever and whenever sold either by producer or dealer."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the motion. It should be "amendment" instead of "instructions."

Mr. CANNON. I hope it may be read again.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARLAND moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Mines and Mining, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out, after the word "empowered," in line 18, page 16, the words "to fix the prices of necessities wherever and whenever sold either by producer or dealer."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND] to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 57.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of order there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 156, noes 150, answered "present" 4, not voting 120, as follows:

YEAS—156.

Anderson	Browning	Clark, Fla.	Dominick
Anthony	Buchanan	Collier	Dowell
Bell	Burroughs	Connally, Tex.	Dunn
Black	Campbell, Kans.	Crisp	Dyer
Brand	Candler, Miss.	Currie, Mich.	Eagle
Bowers	Cannon	Dallinger	Elliott
Brand	Chandler, N. Y.	Darrow	Ellsworth
Britten	Chandler, Okla.	Dempsey	Emerson

Fairfield	Juul	Parker, N. J.	Sweet
Farr	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.	Swift
Fess	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Switzer
Focht	Kinkaid	Platt	Taylor, Ark.
Francis	Knutson	Purnell	Temple
Frear	Kraus	Quin	Thomas
Freeman	La Follette	Ramsdayer	Tilson
Fuller, Ill.	Langley	Rayburn	Timberlake
Fuller, Mass.	Larsen	Reed	Towner
Garland	Lehibach	Robbins	Treadway
Garner	Longworth	Rogers	Vare
Garrett, Tenn.	Lufkin	Rose	Venable
Gillett	McFadden	Rowe	Vestal
Glynn	McKenzie	Sanders, Ind.	Vinson
Good	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, N. Y.	Walker
Gould	Magee	Sanford	Walsh
Graham, Ill.	Mansfield	Scott, Mich.	Wasop
Gray, N. J.	Martin	Sears	Watson, Pa.
Green, Iowa	Mason	Sells	Wheeler
Greene, Mass.	Meeker	Sherley	White, Me.
Greene, Vt.	Merritt	Siegel	White, Ohio
Hadley	Miller, Minn.	Sinnot	Williams
Hamilton, Mich.	Miller, Wash.	Sisson	Wilson, Ill.
Hardy	Mondell	Slayden	Wilson, Tex.
Helm	Moore, Pa.	Sloan	Winslow
Hersey	Moore, Ind.	Snell	Wise
Hicks	Morgan	Snyder	Wood, Ind.
Hollingsworth	Mudd	Stephens, Miss.	Woods, Iowa
Hull, Iowa	Osborne	Sterling, Ill.	Woodyard
Hutchinson	Overstreet	Stinson	Young, Tex.
Ireland	Paige	Strong	Zihlman

NAYS—150

Alexander	Dillon	Keating	Robinson
Ashbrook	Dixon	Kelly, Pa.	Romjue
Aswell	Donovan	Kettner	Ruby
Ayres	Doolittle	Key, Ohio	Rucker
Bankhead	Drane	Kincheloe	Russell
Barkley	Elston	Kitchin	Sabath
Beakes	Esch	Lea, Cal.	Saunders, Va.
Beshlin	Evans	Lee, Ga.	Shackelford
Blackmon	Ferris	Leshner	Shallenberger
Blanton	Fisher	Lever	Sherwood
Booher	Flood	Linthicum	Sims
Borland	Foster	Little	Smith, Idaho
Brodbeck	French	Lobeck	Smith, C. B.
Browne	Gallivan	London	Stafford
Brumbaugh	Gandy	Loneragan	Steagall
Burnett	Gard	Lundeen	Stedman
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tex.	McAndrews	Steenerson
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, Ark.	McClintic	Stephens, Nebr.
Cantrill	Gordon	McKeown	Stevenson
Caraway	Griest	Mapes	Tague
Carver, Okla.	Griffin	Mays	Talbott
Cary	Hamill	Moon	Taylor, Colo.
Church	Hamlin	Nelson	Tillman
Classon	Harrison, Miss.	Nolan	Van Dyke
Claypool	Harrison, Va.	Oldfield	Volstead
Cleary	Hastings	Oliver, Ala.	Walton
Coady	Hayden	Oliver, N. Y.	Watkins
Connelly, Kans.	Healin	Overmyer	Watson, Va.
Cooper, Wis.	Helvering	Padgett	Weaver
Cox	Hensley	Park	Welling
Dale, N. Y.	Hilliard	Polk	Welty
Davidson	Holland	Pou	Whaley
Davis	Huddleston	Rainey, H. T.	Wilson, La.
Decker	Hull, Tenn.	Rainey, J. W.	Wingo
Delaney	Humphreys	Raker	Wright
Denton	Igoe	Randall	Young, N. Dak.
Dickinson	James	Rankin	
Dill	Johnson, Ky.	Roberts	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Haugen	Nicholls, S. C.	Rodenberg	Rouse
--------	-----------------	-----------	-------

NOT VOTING—120.

Almon	Eagan	Kahn	Powers
Austin	Edmonds	Kehoe	Pratt
Bacharach	Estopinal	Kelley, Mich.	Price
Baer	Fairchild, B. L.	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale
Barnhart	Fairchild, G. W.	Kiess, Pa.	Ramsey
Butler	Fields	King	Reavis
Caldwell	Flynn	Kreider	Riordan
Campbell, Pa.	Fordney	LaGuardia	Rowland
Carew	Foss	Lazarro	Sanders, La.
Carlin	Gallagher	Littlepage	Schall
Carter, Mass.	Glass	Lunn	Scott, Iowa
Clark, Pa.	Goodwin, N. C.	McArthur	Scott, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Goodall	McCormick	Scully
Cooper, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	McCulloch	Shouse
Copley	Gray, Ala.	McKinley	Slemp
Costello	Gregg	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snail
Crago	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLemore	Smith, Mich.
Cramton	Haskell	Madden	Smith, T. F.
Crosser	Hawley	Maher	Snook
Curry, Cal.	Hayes	Mann	Steele
Dale, Vt.	Heaton	Montague	Sterling, Pa.
Denison	Heintz	Morin	Sullivan
Dent	Hood	Mott	Sumners
Dewalt	Houston	Neely	Templeton
Dies	Howard	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Dooling	Husted	Norton	Tinkham
Doremus	Jacoway	Olney	Voigt
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	O'Shaunessy	Waldow
Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Phelan	Ward
Dupré	Jones	Porter	Webb

So the motion to recommit the bill was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. DALE of Vermont.
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. REAVIS.
 Mr. BARNHART with Mr. FORDNEY.
 Mr. FIELDS with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.
 Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. MCKINLEY.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. FOSS.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HAUGEN.
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. ALMON with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. CRAGO.
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. AUSTIN.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. CROSSER with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. BACHARACH.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. COPLEY.
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. DENISON.
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. CRAMTON.
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. DRUKKER.
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. EDMONDS.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. HEATON.
 Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. HAWLEY.
 Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 Mr. GREGG with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. LAZARO with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. LUNN with Mr. KING.
 Mr. MCLEMORE with Mr. MCARTHUR.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. MCCULLOCH.
 Mr. NEELY with Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 Mr. SNOOK with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. VOIGT.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. WALDOW.
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. REAVIS. I voted "nay," but I wish to change my vote and answer "present."

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay," but I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MADDEN, and I withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I report the bill H. R. 11250 back to the House with instructions to strike out, in line 18, page 16, the words:

To fix the price of necessities, wherever and whenever sold, either by producer or dealer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] reports back the amendment that was offered in the motion to recommit.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.
 Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the previous question has been ordered under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered.

Mr. FOSTER. I move the previous question.

Mr. CANNON. The previous question is operating.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I think it is operating.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is provided for in the rule. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment contained in the instructions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. GILLETT. Does not the Speaker wish to reconsider that?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is right. The question is on the bill as amended.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of passing the bill will, as their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 290, nays 7, answered "present" 4, not voting 129, as follows:

YEAS—290.

Alexander	Evans	Kinkaid	Russell
Anderson	Fairfield	Kitchin	Sabath
Anthony	Farr	Knutson	Sanders, Ind.
Ashbrook	Ferris	Kraus	Sanders, La.
Aswell	Fess	Langley	Saunders, Va.
Ayres	Fisher	Larsen	Scott, Mich.
Bankhead	Flood	Lee, Cal.	Sells
Barkley	Focht	Lee, Ga.	Shackelford
Beakes	Foster	Leibach	Shallenberger
Bell	Francis	Leshner	Sherley
Beshlin	Frear	Lever	Sherwood
Black	Freeman	Lithicum	Siegel
Blackmon	French	Little	Sinnott
Blanton	Fuller, Ill.	Lobeck	Sisson
Booher	Fuller, Mass.	London	Slayden
Borland	Gallivan	Longworth	Sloan
Bowers	Gandy	Lufkin	Smith, Idaho
Brand	Gard	Lundeen	Smith, C. B.
Britton	Garland	McAndrews	Snell
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Snyder
Browne	Gillett	McFadden	Steagall
Browning	Glynn	McKenzie	Stedman
Brumbaugh	Good	McKeown	Steenerson
Buchanan	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stevenson
Burnett	Gordon	Magee	Strong
Burrage	Gould	Mansfield	Sweet
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	Mapes	Swift
Byrns, Tenn.	Gray, N. J.	Martin	Switzer
Campbell, Kans.	Green, Iowa	Mason	Tague
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Mays	Talbot
Cantrill	Greene, Vt.	Meeker	Taylor, Ark.
Caraway	Griest	Merritt	Taylor, Colo.
Carter, Okla.	Griffin	Miller, Wash.	Temple
Cary	Hadley	Moon	Tillman
Chandler, Okla.	Hamill	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Moores, Ind.	Timberlake
Classon	Hamlin	Morgan	Towner
Claypool	Hardy	Mudd	Treadway
Cleary	Harrison, Miss.	Nelson	Van Dyke
Coady	Harrison, Va.	Nolan	Venable
Collier	Hastings	Oldfield	Vestal
Connally, Tex.	Haugen	Oliver, Ala.	Vinson
Connolly, Kans.	Hayden	Oliver, N. Y.	Voigt
Cooper, Wis.	Heflin	Osborne	Volstead
Cox	Helm	Overmyer	Walker
Crisp	Helvering	Overstreet	Walsh
Currie, Mich.	Hensley	Padgett	Walton
Dale, N. Y.	Hersey	Palge	Wason
Dallinger	Hicks	Park	Watkins
Darrow	Hilliard	Parker, N. J.	Watson, Pa.
Davidson	Holland	Parker, N. Y.	Watson, Va.
Davis	Hollingsworth	Peters	Weaver
Decker	Huddleston	Platt	Webb
Delaney	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Welling
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Pou	Welty
Denton	Humphreys	Purnell	Whaley
Dickinson	Hutchinson	Quin	Wheeler
Dill	Igoe	Rainey, J. W.	White, Me.
Dillon	Ireland	Raker	White, Ohio
Dixon	James	Ramseyer	Williams
Domineck	Johnson, Ky.	Randall	Wilson, Ill.
Donovan	Juul	Rankin	Wilson, La.
Doolittle	Kearns	Reed	Wingo
Doremus	Keating	Robbins	Winslow
Dowell	Kehoe	Roberts	Wise
Drane	Kelley, Mich.	Robinson	Wood, Ind.
Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Rodenberg	Woodyard
Dyer	Kennedy, Iowa	Rogers	Wright
Eagle	Kettner	Romjue	Young, N. Dak.
Ellsworth	Key, Ohio	Rose	Young, Tex.
Elston	Kliss, Pa.	Rowe	Zihlman
Emerson	Kincheloe	Ruby	

NAYS—7.

Cannon	Garrett, Tenn.	Stafford	Thomas
Elliott	La Follette	Sterling, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Clark, Fla.	Nicholls, S. C.	Rouse	Sears
-------------	-----------------	-------	-------

NOT VOTING—129.

Almon	Crago	Fairchild, B. L.	Heaton
Austin	Cramton	Fairchild, G. W.	Heintz
Bacharach	Crosser	Fields	Hood
Baer	Curry, Cal.	Flynn	Houston
Barnhart	Dale, Vt.	Fordney	Howard
Butler	Denison	Foss	Husted
Caldwell	Dent	Gallagher	Jacoway
Campbell, Pa.	Dewalt	Glass	Johnson, S. Dak.
Carew	Dies	Godwin, N. C.	Johnson, Wash.
Carlin	Dooling	Goodall	Jones
Carter, Mass.	Doughton	Graham, Pa.	Kahn
Chandler, N. Y.	Drukker	Gray, Ala.	Kennedy, R. I.
Clark, Pa.	Dupré	Gregg	King
Cooper, Ohio	Eagan	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kreider
Cooper, W. Va.	Edmonds	Haskell	LaGuardia
Copley	Esch	Hawley	Lazaro
Costello	Estopinal	Hayes	Littlepage

Lunn	Nichols, Mich.	Rucker	Stephens, Nebr.
McArthur	Norton	Sanders, N. Y.	Sterling, Pa.
McCormick	Olney	Sanford	Stiness
McCulloch	O'Shaunessy	Schall	Sullivan
McKinley	Phelan	Scott, Iowa	Summers
McLaughlin, Pa.	Porter	Scott, Pa.	Templeton
McLemore	Powers	Scully	Thompson
Madden	Pratt	Shouse	Tinkham
Maher	Price	Sims	Vare
Mann	Ragsdale	Slemp	Waldow
Miller, Minn.	Rainey, H. T.	Small	Ward
Mondell	Ramsey	Smith, Mich.	Wilson, Tex.
Montague	Rayburn	Smith, T. F.	Woods, Iowa
Morin	Reavis	Snook	
Mott	Riordan	Steele	
Neely	Rowland	Stephens, Miss.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. CRAMTON.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. ALMON with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. LAZARO with Mr. WALDOW.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. DALE of Vermont.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. HEATON.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. SCOTT of Iowa.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. TEMPLETON.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MADDEN. I wish to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. ROUSE, and he answered "Present."

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from West Virginia, Mr. COOPER, is absent. I believe if he were present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that these sections may be renumbered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may renumber the sections. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. FOSTER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATURALIZATION LAWS.

Mr. BURNETT, by direction of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, presented for printing, under the rule, the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommend the conference report on the bill H. R. 8696, the Indian appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma moves to recommend to the conferees the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Speaker has examined the precedents and made up his mind that the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is in order, I do not wish to discuss the question. Of course, the motion made by the gentleman from Oklahoma establishes, in a way, a precedent in this House. There are rulings by former Speakers that hold that under conditions similar to the situation presented in this case no motion to recommit is necessary; that the printing of the conference report by the gentleman from Oklahoma in the Record, when this House did not have possession of the papers, was without any authority whatsoever.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Was informal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was irregular and should be disregarded completely. I realize that we are establishing a ruling here that will apply in the future many, many times, not only in this body but in the other body. For instance, a conference report is brought into this House; a point of order is made against it; we have the papers and it is considered. The Speaker sustains the point of order that the conferees exceeded their authority. In the other body no action has been taken on the conference report.

It has not even been presented, because, Mr. Speaker, while it is frequently the practice that conferees present for printing in the RECORD conference reports without the possession of the papers, the conference report has no right to be presented formally for consideration until the conferees are in possession of the papers.

In this case the Senate agreed to the conference and the papers were in the possession of the Senate conferees. When the report was presented to the Senate for action a point of order was made. It is immaterial what was the reason for the Senate recommitting the bill, whether it was in consonance with some rule which was adopted by that body, which provides that no legislation can be added to any amendment by the conferees, or whether it was recommitted on formal vote. If the gentleman from Oklahoma had not presented the conference report for printing in the RECORD, this House would not have been advised whatsoever of the action of the Senate, except informally. The conferees would still be in existence, because they had not presented their report, and they would naturally go back into conference without any action whatever on the part of the House.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is assuming, I think, that the Senate followed out the correct procedure, which it did not do. The situation, Mr. Speaker, is just about this: The Senate has a rule that provides that when a point of order is sustained against a conference report, such report is automatically recommitted to conference. That rule was invoked against this conference report, but when the Senate notified the House of that action, it messaged the papers in connection with the bill along over to the House, and the original papers in connection with the matter are now on the Speaker's desk. I have asked unanimous consent to take them down so that we might get back into conference, but that has been refused by the House, so I know of no way by which the papers can go off the Speaker's desk now except by some action of the House itself. Therefore I have made this motion to bring the matter to the issue of the necessary procedure.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman's unanimous-consent request was to withdraw the conference report which he had previously presented.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The papers were with the conference report. Now, I know of no other way to get at this, Mr. Speaker, so far as the House is concerned. It might be that the Senate could pass a resolution requesting the return of the papers to the Senate, and in that way conform to the procedure as it has been in the past and as it was supposed to be by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I made no request. I moved to recommit the bill to conference.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that one of two things ought to be done, in view of the rules of the Senate. When we remember the condition of affairs at the close of the session, when time is of the utmost importance, we realize what difficulty we would have if this procedure should have to be gone through with and a point of order should be sustained, as it was in this instance in the Senate. Either the rules of the House ought to be amended so that this bill could automatically go back to conference or else the Chair ought to make a ruling that would send the bill automatically back to conference without any motion.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If the Senate had retained possession of the papers, as is the practice when sending a bill back to conference, then the bill would have gone back to conference automatically; but when they sent their message to the House, after the conference report had been recommitted, it seems they made the mistake of sending the papers along with the report, and the papers are now on the Speaker's table, unavailable to the conferees except by permission of the House. The House managers have not been discharged. All precedents hold the conference committee to be still in existence. The committee is not functus officio; it could function if it only had possession of the papers. Now, the only thing necessary to be done to unscramble the eggs and the only thing the conferees or the House should concern itself about is in transferring legal possession of the original papers in the case from the House to the House conferees. Since we have failed to get unanimous consent I know of no way that can be done if such a motion as this is ruled out of order.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, in this connection let me direct the attention of the Chair to one other point. Is there a confer-

ence committee existing on the part of the House pertaining to this Indian bill? If the Chair holds that it is necessary for the House by a motion to send the bill back to conference, is it not further necessary for the Chair to appoint conferees again? And would not the House have the right under the rules to select the conferees if it desired to do so—to change the conferees? The Speaker or even the House would have the right to change the conferees, naming different conferees than those that formerly existed on this bill. So I suggest to the Chair that one of two things ought to be done. Either the rules ought to be amended so that this bill would go back to conference automatically with the same conferees, or else the Speaker ought to hold, in order to facilitate matters, that it does not go back automatically to those same conferees, because we would naturally have to select new conferees if the Chair held that it was necessary to send it back to conference. If there is no conference, there are no conferees, and therefore in sending it back to conference the Chair would have to reappoint the conferees.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. Mr. WALSH. The gentleman does not contend that we ought to permit another body to make rules for us, does he?

Mr. GARNER. Oh, no; but I do contend, Mr. Speaker, that our rules ought to contain whatever is necessary to facilitate the action of this House in connection with the action of another body.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, so far as I have been able to determine from precedents, the Senate was clearly within its right when it recommitted this conference report. It has been ruled time and again that either House has a right to recommit a conference report, provided either House has not taken such action as would discharge its conferees. That was ruled once in a controversy over this very same bill.

In the second session of the Fifty-eighth Congress the Senate recommitted the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, and the point of order made against that motion was overruled by the Vice President. The House procedure in that case, to a certain point, was somewhat similar to this. The House seemed to have filed its conference report informally before the Senate took the action of recommitting. After the Senate recommitted, the conferees went back into session, taking up the Senate amendments de novo. When the report had been completed, one of the House managers presented the report for printing under the rules. The point of order was made that a report had already been filed and not disposed of. The Chair overruled the point of order on the ground that the filing of the report by the House conferees did not contain the original papers and was therefore informal.

The difference between that case and this seems to be only this: When the Senate messaged their action to the House on the former case the papers did not accompany the message, and the Chair seems to have held on that occasion that the bill went back to conference automatically. Undoubtedly that would apply to this situation but for the fact that when the Senate messaged this action of recommitment over to the House this time it sent along with the message the original papers in the case, thereby placing them on the Speaker's desk.

What action has been taken in the House to discharge its conferees? No action whatever has been taken by the House except the mere informal filing of the report for printing. The filing of the report, even if formal and accompanied by the papers, is not a disposal of the report. It does not even constitute consideration of the report, so there can be no doubt about the present existence of the conference committee so far as the House conferees are concerned.

Mr. GARNER. If the conferees exist now, why is it necessary for the House to take any action at all?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. On account of the mistake made by the Senate in messaging the original papers from the Senate to the House, the papers being on the Speaker's desk and the conferees being unable to get them without some action by the House.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GILLETT. But if the same point of order had been made in the House as was made in the Senate—and, of course, it might have been—that would have amounted here to a rejection of the conference report, would it not?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; that would have been the effect.

Mr. GILLETT. Ought we to allow the conference report to be rejected here by a point of order, while in the Senate the conference report is sent back to the conferees by a point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. When there are none in existence?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. But the conferees are in existence now.

Mr. GILLET. But if anybody should make the point of order here against that conference report it would have to be sustained, and this conference report would be rejected, and therefore there would not be any conferees.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; but the Senate rules differ from the rules of the House in that respect. The Senate rule provides that the sustaining of a point of order against a conference report automatically recommits the measure to conference.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But to whom?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. You can move to recommit the conference report in the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To whom?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. To the conference committee, provided the conferees have not been discharged.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Provided there is a conference committee in existence.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; provided the conferees are in existence, it is competent to move to recommit the conference report in the House or in the Senate.

Mr. GILLET. But we do not want this question to come up on every conference report.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GILLET. It seems to me we had better settle it one way or the other.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I want to settle it now, and that is the purpose of my motion.

Mr. GILLET. But it does not seem to me this is a good way to settle it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, of course the Senate rules can not operate further than upon the Members of its own body or upon its own agents, or functionaries. But the mere fact that the Senate has made a rule which operates of its own force to have the effect of a recommitment is no reason why the House should raise a controversy with that body over that particular rule, so long as it does not operate to our prejudice, or disadvantage. The fact that the rules of the Senate provide that a ruling sustaining a point of order to a conference report shall have the same effect as a motion recommitting the report is nothing that concerns us. Of course it would be competent under the rules of the Senate to make a formal motion to recommit a report to the conferees, so long as there was a joint conference committee to which that report could be recommitment. The sole question that interests us is, whether there is such a conference committee. That inquiry can be answered by an appeal to our own procedure, and our own records.

Has this House taken any action which has operated to discharge our members of the conference committee? If so, what is it? As I understand, from the facts stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma the action that has been taken is by no means sufficient to effect such a discharge. It seems that as a result of some informality, the papers are here, when as a matter of fact, they should be in the Senate. That being so the gentleman from Oklahoma asks that these papers be remitted to the conference committee which is still in existence, inasmuch as no action in either body has operated to discharge it. If it is contended that the conference committee of the House has been discharged by any action that we have taken, then I ask again what is that action? That is the one inquiry to which we should direct our attention. Of course I repudiate any suggestion that the Senate by the operation of its own rules can control our procedure, or the joint procedure, or in any way impinge on the rights of the House. I would resent any effort to that end by the Senate in the most emphatic manner. But it is certainly competent for the Senate to recommit a report to a conference committee still in being. No objection to that action on their part could be raised in this body. It seems to me the report heretofore made by the gentleman from Oklahoma is merely an informal report in the absence of the possession on his part of the papers. This report is insufficient to discharge our conferees, no action on the same having been taken. This informal action should not be treated as more than such, and if so regarded, then it is not that action which is considered necessary to discharge a committee of conference. But if our conference committee is still in existence, then the action of the Senate recommitting the report has not impinged in any wise upon our authority or dignity. It is a matter of no concern to us whether the recommitment in the Senate was effected by a point of order, or a formal motion.

It seems to me that the simplest way to deal with this situation would be for the gentleman from Oklahoma on behalf of

his committee to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the papers now in our possession, for the purpose of further conference with the Senate committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], the conference report is still in existence. No action whatever has been taken by the House that would discharge the House conferees. No action has been taken by the Senate to discharge its conferees. Therefore the conferees on the Indian appropriation bill are still in existence. By an irregularity the House conferees submitted a conference report under the rule when they, as a matter of fact, did not have the papers.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman knows, of course, that that is the usual procedure.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I know it is generally done; and no notice would have been taken of this, and no embarrassment would have occurred, if it had not been for the subsequent proceedings in the Senate; that report having been filed gave notice to the House, as far as the House was concerned, that the conferees had come to a decision upon a distinct agreement with the Senate. But subsequently the Senate disposed of the action of the conferees in a summary way, and instead of sending the papers back to conference, as they should have done, they messaged the papers over to the House, where they did not belong, and they are now on the Speaker's desk. It seems to me that the proper way to dispose of them is by unanimous consent or by a motion, made by the gentleman from Oklahoma, to refer the papers where they properly belong—to the committee of conference—just as an erroneous reference of a bill to a committee may on motion be properly referred to the committee to which it properly belongs.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the real point of controversy is whether there is in existence a conference committee on the part of the two Houses. If the Senate instead of rejecting the report of the conference committee, by virtue of a point of order made and sustained, had rejected the report by a direct vote, by which they simply turned down the conference, I assume it would not be contended that the conference committee was still in existence. Now, the same effect seems to follow when they reject a conference report on a point of order, and it seems to me that what the House ought to do is to agree that the papers shall be taken from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, agree to a conference, and appoint conferees, just as if the old conference committee were dead forever, and I think it is.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. But the Senate has not requested a conference.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then we should request a conference.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. What the gentleman from Kentucky says would be correct if the conference report had been rejected by the Senate on motion to that effect, but that is what the Senate did not do. A point of order was sustained against the report, and the new Senate rule provides that this specific action automatically recommits the matter under consideration to conference.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is the whole matter. The rule is what made the whole issue. It does not seem to me that a House has a right to reject a report—

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. We do the same thing here.

Mr. SHERLEY. What the House does is to reject the report and then it goes into a new conference.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The House often recommits a conference report to the conference committee. It took such action last summer on the conscription bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. It does not reject it and then recommit it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The difficulty we got into arose when the Senate recommitment the bill to the committee of conference, and they messaged the news over here by the usual resolution, which would have been all right if they had not also sent the papers. But, while we have the physical possession of the papers, the Chair doubts very much whether we have them in the right way. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] cites a decision. The Chair has examined all these decisions, but they are not like the present case, because we have the physical possession of these papers. The Chair does not think the conference committee is dead. The Senate specifically referred it to the conferees.

If the committee of conference is alive, the only question is how to get these papers out of this House back to that conference committee, and the Chair thinks that the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] is in order.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to prefer a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.
Mr. FESS. When do the conferees cease—on the report of the committee here or upon the action of the House?

The SPEAKER. On the action of the House.

Mr. FESS. And if the action is negative, would it be the same as in an affirmative action?

The SPEAKER. If it is an affirmative action, they go out of existence automatically.

Mr. FESS. And a negative action?

The SPEAKER. If the House takes a negative action, they go out, too.

Mr. FESS. That is the question I had in mind.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. If the House was not in possession of these papers, then the Speaker would hold that the conferees continued their work as though no action had been had?

The SPEAKER. Of course. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to take the bill H. R. 8696, the Indian appropriation bill, from the Speaker's table and refer it to the conferees. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WHITE of Maine for the balance of this week, on account of urgent personal business.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11692, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and pending that motion I would ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] if we can not agree upon time for general debate. I would like to have that time just as short as we can have it.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I have investigated upon this side of the Chamber, and, while I am as anxious, perhaps more so, as the gentleman from Mississippi to get this cut short so that we can get down to the merits of what I consider a very good bill, yet I do not see how we can get along on this side with less than three hours.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state, if he has not done so, why three hours of general debate is requested on this bill, and further, whether it is to be debate confined to the bill itself or something that has no relation to it?

Mr. DAVIS. This is general debate, and the information that has come to me quite freely is that during the passage of the naval appropriation bill gentlemen did not have any opportunity for general debate at all, and they are trying, as it were, to unload the general debate upon that bill onto this bill.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I have this information, that some requests for time were made on the naval appropriation bill, and gentlemen who made those requests were asked to defer them and ask for time on this bill or some other bill, which was done under that sort of agreement with the leaders, because of the importance of getting the naval bill through.

Mr. DAVIS. I was stating the substance of the matter just as though the whole House had talked about it instead of the leaders.

Mr. Sisson. That information coming to me causes me to be a little more liberal in any agreement that I would make now. Would five hours in all be satisfactory to the gentleman? I do not think there would be more than two hours consumed on this side, and I will try to give the gentleman 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. If the gentleman will do that, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me, and when I say that I mean the Members on this side of the House who desire to talk.

Mr. Sisson. Then, Mr. Speaker, pending the motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to five hours, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two hours by myself.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. To be confined to the bill?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. Sisson. I understand they do not want the debate confined to the bill. I would like to have it confined to the bill; but in doing that there will be nothing to talk about, because these gentlemen do not care to talk about the District appropriation bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi, pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, asks unanimous consent that general debate

upon the bill be limited to five hours, three hours of which are to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be confined to the bill.

The SPEAKER. And to that the gentleman from Tennessee makes the addendum that the debate be confined to the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I can not agree to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District appropriation bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS. If this motion is agreed to and the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the District appropriation bill, then under the rules of the House will gentlemen be confined to a discussion of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has nothing to do with the Committee of the Whole, but gives it as his own opinion that they would not. The question is on going into Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the District appropriation bill, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill H. R. 11692, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11692) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, in presenting this bill to the House for its consideration I deem it proper first that a short general statement be made outlining the general policy adopted by the subcommittee which made up this bill. The original estimates called for nearly \$5,000,000 more than is carried in this bill.

Wherever the program of the District Commissioners called for an expenditure of large sums of money in an extensive building program your committee denied the appropriation. The building program called for a million and three-quarter dollars for additions to schools alone. We called upon the District Commissioners and the board of education to state to your committee whether or not they believed that the building program could be carried out under present war conditions.

After quite a good deal of discussion it was agreed that the wisest thing to do would be to take care of the increase of children in the schools of the various sections by building portable school buildings. Your committee felt that it would be unwise to try to enter upon an extensive building program at this time. I will give you just one illustration of what we were up against. Three years ago an eight-room addition was proposed to one of the school buildings in the city and they asked for \$75,000. The committee gave the \$75,000. In the meantime the European war had broken out. When the time arrived they advertised for bids. The advertisements were made in accordance with the law, and the smallest bid they got was \$85,000. In last year's appropriation there was carried an appropriation of \$87,500—a leeway of \$2,500. They advertised for bids and the cheapest bid they got on the same building was \$141,000. The District Commissioners, of course, could not accept the bid because it was far in excess of the appropriation. The engineer commissioner said that unless the contracts were let at these enormous and criminal figures it would be utterly impossible to get the building done. Even then it is very doubtful whether or not it could be built on time, for it is doubtful if the building material could be had for this purpose at all.

The greater reason we had in our minds for not entering upon the building program at this time was that it would be an increased demand upon this labor market. The demand now is

far beyond the supply. It is absolutely impossible for the activities of the Government to get the labor essential to carrying on the war activities except with great difficulty.

Another reason was that this building program would necessitate contractors bringing quite a number of laborers into the District of Columbia, where the housing facilities are taxed beyond the capacity of the District already. The committee was absolutely harmonious on this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I will take this opportunity to say that the entire subcommittee that made up this bill were a unit on the proposition that everything should be done with an eye single to winning this war; that wherever the activities in civil life interfered with the proper prosecution of the war it was our duty to let the activities of civil life remain in abeyance until this war is won. At this time the efforts of all the American people should be turned to the one great object of our lives, and that is the proper prosecution of the war, because the very life of the Nation and the very liberties we have always held dearer than life are involved in this great struggle.

Mr. Chairman, it is also my privilege to state that during our deliberations it would have been impossible to have told who was a Democrat or who was a Republican because we were dealing with nonpartisan questions entirely in this bill. Each member of the committee was willing that where a civil activity interfered with a military necessity, we, without a dissenting vote, made the civil activity wait.

This is a momentous day in the history of the world. In making up this bill your committee never for one moment forgot the all-important question, "America must win the war." Since war was declared, as a member of this great committee, I have never permitted anything to prevent my making this the paramount question. Some have said that America should not have entered this war. While I differ with them, I will not now quarrel with them if they will now say that since we are in I am now with my country and we must win. If he will say my all is now upon the altar of my country and we must all pay, fight, and die, if need be, as one man for America and American ideals and to save our own liberty and the liberty of the world, I will forget his former position.

Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the Members I may state here my position in reference to our duty as Members of Congress toward the war. I think it proper at this time to state my position, so that if you should see something needed to be done here in the District that is not done in this bill, your committee I think to a man will be in accord with me when I say that we left it undone because we would not do anything that would impede or interfere with our war program.

These are times that try men's souls and offer opportunities for service and heroism never before offered to a people in any age of the world's history. Opportunity for the greatest sacrifice is offered to us all in this favored land. No American can excuse himself from some kind of service. If he can not fight, he can pay; if he can not pay, he can labor; if he can neither labor or pay, he can pray. He can use his influence. He can help unify American sentiment. He can help arouse America to the proper sense of our danger, and this is a great service.

So I say every one in America can do something now for his country. Let us stop criticizing and confer with each other. Let us be tolerant with the opinion of others and be not too quick to question the other man's motive. He may be right. Let us all in the proper spirit, from the President down, try to prevent mistakes. Do not hesitate to call attention to dangers which we see, but do so in a true American spirit. If mistakes have been made, do not condemn, if the mistake was an honest one and there was no perfidy in it. Whatever a man's past opinion has been before the declaration of war, let us forget that, provided he is right now. I am not interested in an American's former attitude. What I am interested in is where do you stand now. Are you 100 per cent American now? Will you fight now? Will you pay now? Will you help now?

Every man in the South loves Robert E. Lee. But when the Civil War broke out Lee was not in accord with secession. What if he had been condemned on that ground? The South would have lost its greatest commander. No man will now say that Lee did not do his duty. So I say to all Americans who thought we should not have gone into this war I will not condemn you. I forget his former position if he is right now and stays right to the end. Those of us who are denied the high privilege of going to the front can show that we are right now, not by words but by acts and deeds. At the present moment every man can do the task we now have on hand. The most important present task is to raise the money for the third liberty loan. Do it now. I will never question the young boy's patriotism who goes to France and gives his young life

fighting bravely the battles of liberty for America solely because before we got into the struggle this boy thought we should not go into the fight. Nor will I question the patriotism of the man who now gives his money and his boy and is willing to give his life for the cause solely because he differed with me about going into this war. Look over America to-day. How many, many men were opposed to our going into the war but are now doing their full duty by their country and are now in the forefront of the battle, even though denied the honor of going into the fighting line.

The Capital City can not afford to be a slacker city in any line. Every officer and employee of the Government has an opportunity to show the Nation and the world by their example what the real spirit of the Nation is. Buy bonds to the limit of your ability. More than that, become more efficient in your work than ever before. Do not complain if the task assigned is hard. Perform it and do it well. If it takes overtime, do it and be thankful for the opportunity to serve your Government in this hour of peril. Think of the service the noble boys in the ranks are compelled to perform in sunshine, in cold, and in rain. Keep that picture in your mind and the task at your desk will seem light.

Let the American spirit of 1775 be the spirit of 1918. Let the battle cry of Patrick Henry, uttered in old St. John's Episcopal Church, at Richmond, Va., where the Virginia convention was held, be America's cry to-day. When men were doubtful and wavering this patriot's words, "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death," went quivering and shivering along the veins and arteries of all patriots from Maine to Georgia. Young America buckled on the sword and shouldered the musket for human liberty.

It was 143 years ago this month, on that beautiful spring morning of April, 1775, when the Minute Men at Lexington were fired upon. That was the shot which "was heard round the world." The same sacred cause is calling us. The same cause for which Patrick Henry spoke the inspired words in old St. John's Church is the same cause for which I speak now. Little did Maj. Pitcairn dream when he ordered his soldiers to fire that shot at Lexington that he had released an irresistible and unconquerable force which started a chain of events which is now culminating in the world strife of to-day. Its echoes aroused the Green Mountain boys—caused Putnam to leave the plow in the furrow. Patrick Henry gave voice to the true American sentiment in every liberty-loving heart, and called the patriots of Virginia and the Carolinas, yea, the patriots of all the South, and with the patriots of all the North as brethren in the great struggle for liberty, which continued until the Declaration of Independence became an established fact and America became a land of free men.

Again, in 1812, the same sentiment aroused our people to a new and broader defense of our liberties and freedom, and the victory of American patriots under Andrew Jackson at New Orleans gave America and all nations the right to sail the seas.

The same spirit caused the promulgation of the Monroe doctrine, which was a declaration of independence for all the Western Hemisphere. It was this same spirit which found its way along the Sierras of Mexico and gave her the power to end the long-continued misrule of Spain. It was this same spirit that caused the same battle cry to reverberate up and down the length of the Andes and over the llanos and pampas of South America, and called our brethren of South America to struggle for freedom, until under the leadership of Simon Bolivar the last shackles of slavery were stricken off and the colonies of the Spanish grandees became free nations. Oceans were no barriers to this sentiment of freedom, for it leaped the turbulent waters of the Atlantic, and the people of Europe admit the benefits of the American Revolution. In England, France, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden they revere the name of Washington, and the Fourth of July is with them a sacred day. Yea, France filled with this sentiment found in America her example, and in her struggle for freedom found the new inspiration in this example and has become one of the freest people on earth. Yea, the downtrodden and oppressed people of all nations are longing for the same freedom for themselves.

But to-day the issue is not that of one nation struggling to be free. This is a world struggle for freedom. The forces of darkness and hate have ranged themselves under the banner of autocracy and for the subjugation of the world. They are being met by the hosts of free nations who will never, in my judgment, cease the conflict until the American idea of liberty is crowned with victory and men everywhere have the right to be at peace with the rest of mankind and among themselves.

This great American idea of liberty and freedom is not confined to martial affairs and the roar of cannon and machine

guns. Every struggle for the betterment of humanity is but a continuation of the battle for the rights of man. The right to be free; the right of every man to feel that he is a sovereign and to obey only the dictates of his own conscience and laws that define the civic rights of all with no special discrimination or favors to the strong; the right to free and popular education; the right of complete and absolute separation of the Church and State with absolute toleration for all religions and favors for none; the right of trial by jury sacredly secured; the right of open legislative assemblies; the right of writ of habeas corpus except when suspended by proper authority in time of war; the right to be confronted with witnesses in open court; the right of absolute and untrammelled freedom of speech and press; the right of the people to peaceably assemble to discuss for themselves matters of public and private interest; the right of petition by the people for any grievance they may have; the right of equal and uniform taxation and an economical government honestly administered so that labor may be lightly burdened and equal right to all under the law, no titles of royalty by birth or by law, and no life tenures of office are some of the touchstones of Democracy announced by America for the guidance of the world. For these we are battling to-day. For the preservation of these rights and principles let us pledge our property, our lives, and our sacred honor.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of Congress, I am sure, shares with me these sentiments and convictions. The American people as a whole also have the same sublime sense of duty. I am willing to lay aside everything to win the war. We must suffer some inconveniences—so must the people of the District of Columbia. I am sure that they are willing to suffer some inconvenience.

But we do not propose to neglect the children. We do not believe it wise that the children be denied at any costs proper educational opportunities. We should be willing to sacrifice all luxury and comfort for them. Therefore the District Commissioners and the Board of Education prepared a statement of the portable buildings that would be needed to take care of the overcrowded schools. Your committee gave them that amount of money and that item is made immediately available in this bill, so that accounts for the large item you will find in the bill in reference to public schools. We left out, however, the expensive building program.

Another item to which I would call your attention, which is not usually in a District bill, is an item of \$25,000 for the Council of National Defense. The activities under this head are similar to those performed in the States by the State government in reference to the selective draft. For instance, in the various counties throughout the States the governor selects those members in the various counties who become the draft board of the county, and the States have been bearing a certain proportion of that expense. In other words, certain of those State officials do not get any money for their services; a few of them do—those who devote all of their time and attention. Now, the performance of that duty was devolved upon the District Commissioners. It became necessary for them to have a great deal of stationery, to employ some extra services; and the District officials who gave their time to it get nothing and will get nothing, except one clerk, who gets an increase of \$300 a year, which is carried in another item. With that exception, this \$25,000 is intended for the District's share in taking care of the selective draft.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is it intended out of this \$25,000 to pay the salaries of members of the exemption boards here in the District?

Mr. Sisson. No; they, as a rule, get no salary.

Mr. HASTINGS. So far as I am advised, if the gentleman will permit me, in my State of Oklahoma no member of any exemption board was paid anything.

Mr. Sisson. That is true in my State, also.

Mr. HASTINGS. And the clerical force volunteered their services throughout the State of Oklahoma. Now, I do think perhaps some of their expenses were paid, and it is my information—

Mr. Sisson. The expenses are paid in the gentleman's State as well as the others.

Mr. HASTINGS. My information is that nothing was paid in salaries, but they all volunteered their services; and I was just wondering what salaries were to be paid out of this appropriation of \$25,000. I was in hopes the people here in the District of Columbia were as patriotic and could be depended upon to volunteer their services the same as in the States throughout the Union.

Mr. Sisson. I will say to the gentleman no salary has been paid to these various boards throughout the States. It is only to certain of the clerical force; and then they have had to rent some property. But this board here is also endeavoring to assist in taking care of the housing proposition for the people who are brought here by the War Department and Navy Department.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Is it not true that each member of these exemption boards is entitled to draw \$3 a day if he desires to do so, but that in many cases the members have waived that and volunteered their services?

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will yield just a moment further, let me say that that was true out in Oklahoma, but the governor of the State of Oklahoma notified the members that if they wanted to draw any salary he would accept their resignation, and but very few of them resigned under those circumstances. And as the result of it, as I understand, none of them were paid any salary at all, although perhaps a few were paid expenses.

Mr. MAPES. I think that in the country over very many have volunteered their services.

Mr. Sisson. That is true.

In addition to the activity that I have just mentioned they have down on New York Avenue an office, and they also maintain a booth in the Union Station, so that in the event that employees, especially young ladies, come to the city of Washington, the Civil Service Commission notifies them that there is a booth at the Union Station and an office down on New York Avenue, to which they can apply for assistance in getting rooms, because that has been an extremely difficult problem, not only to get a room in which they may physically stop, but to endeavor to get a room at a reasonable price. And if Congress does not in some way protect us against the exorbitant prices that are charged Government clerks and other officers and employees we will be compelled to radically increase their salary. So your committee thought, after investigation, that this was money wisely spent. You may ask how it has been taken care of in the past. It was taken care of by the President out of the \$100,000,000 contingent fund. So your committee thought that that was a proper expenditure and allowed the sum.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I will.

Mr. FESS. None of this \$25,000 is taken out of the District treasury? It is all taken out of the Federal Treasury, is it not?

Mr. Sisson. No; half of it.

Mr. FESS. Why should half of it be taken out of the District treasury?

Mr. Sisson. Because the District of Columbia and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia feel that, just as the States of the Union pay, some of them, large sums of money—

Mr. FESS. I was not aware of that. I did not suppose the States paid.

Mr. Sisson. Some of them raised as much as a million dollars, and some of them much more than that, for national defense.

Mr. FESS. Is that voluntary on the part of the State or statutory?

Mr. Sisson. It is statutory. The legislatures, you know, make the appropriations.

Mr. FESS. To take care of the draft?

Mr. Sisson. No; not to take care of the draft, but to take care of what they call the national defense or State defense. They have a State defense organization in every State of the Union, so far as I know, where the State is endeavoring to take care of—

Mr. FESS. I understand that, but what I was confused over was the statement that the \$25,000 was applied to take care of the draft here in the District.

Mr. Sisson. No; take care of certain stationery accounts. All the States had that to pay, except the blanks. For instance, the correspondence between the local boards and the drafted men sometimes gets to be quite expensive. There is a certain character of that work that ought to have been made, in my judgment, subject to frank, but certain letters have not been frankable, and they have had to pay quite a good deal of money out of the State treasury in connection with the draft. Now, there are certain services that are paid for, specifically enumerated in the military bill, and those employees are paid directly out of the Federal Treasury. But this is an entirely separate and distinct character of activity from that.

Now, I want to call your attention to the street improvements. The streets of the city of Washington are not in good condition. Your subcommittee visited the streets. You can find a great

deal more by a personal visit to a street than you can by testimony. Your subcommittee went over the streets out in the outskirts of the city, the real estate activities. A remarkable thing happened with your subcommittee. We each had a sheet of paper with the proposed streets to be improved written on it. Neither of us knew what the other's idea was, and agreed not to discuss it until we got back into the committee. Each member of the subcommittee had his streets marked for himself indicating his opinion at the time as to the necessity of improving it. Neither of us knew what the other's opinion was until we got back into the committee and began marking up the bill, and my recollection is we differed only as to one street.

Now, to be frank about the street proposition. There are many of the streets in the outskirts where there were only a few houses, maybe only one or two on the street, where it was a purely real estate proposition, as it struck us. Now, to put all that building program in would be a great burden upon the railroads to bring material, and a further demand upon the labor of the District. The enormous prices to be paid now for materials and labor caused your subcommittee to give money for streets that they thought were imperatively necessary to be laid. But when we came to consider the condition of the important streets in the old portion of the city, as well as what is called the "suburban roads"—I do not know why they make that distinction, because you go out of one portion of that imaginary division now into the other without knowing it—wherever the money was to be expended in repair, your subcommittee gave them every dollar they asked.

We thought it wise to keep the streets already laid in repair. The very severe winter, the enormous amount of heavy hauling, that has not heretofore been so general for so long a time, has put the streets in bad condition and broken them up into holes. So your subcommittee gave every dollar asked for on the street repair. The repair fund is an entirely different fund from the fund for laying new pavement and new sidewalks. Now, if we had laid the original pavement on these new streets, of course the property owners would have paid their pro rata share of the amount under the law.

But your subcommittee were not deterred on that account. The two propositions were, first, the enormous price to be paid, and, second, the absolute and imperative necessity of not making greater the demand for labor and the fact that we wanted to conserve every dollar that we could in the prosecution of the war. So the same reasoning that prompted your subcommittee not to enter into a building program as to the schools, but to adopt some portable buildings, was the impelling motive that caused your subcommittee not to enter into a system of general street improvements throughout the city. Those are the two items—street improvements and schools—where the subcommittee was able to save the greatest amount of money.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. If the gentleman will permit, I want to know why should the United States pay for the paving of Washington streets, except in front of public buildings?

Mr. Sisson. I will say to my good friend that he has asked a question that I myself have asked many times, but your subcommittee is not dealing with that proposition, because we are an appropriating committee and not a legislative committee. If the gentleman had been here during one of the very severe fights we had on this bill in past years, when my friend from Minnesota [Mr. Davis] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Page] and I labored together on this subcommittee, he would have seen the terrific fight that we made to get the property owners to pay anything on the streets or sidewalks, and he would then understand some of the reasons why that is now the law. But that, of course, would be aside from this discussion.

Mr. JUUL. Under what method are you proceeding? What percentage is the property holder paying for the local improvements on his property?

Mr. Sisson. Twenty-five per cent of the original payment is made by the property owner on each side, and 25 per cent from the National Treasury and 25 per cent from the District treasury. That, however, has not long been the law; but that is the law now, which we can not change in an appropriation bill because it would be subject to a point of order. With the gentleman's indulgence I would like to avoid getting into a discussion of that.

Mr. JUUL. With the flood of gold that is poured from all the States of the Union into this city, why should the Federal Government be required to pay half of the running expenses of this city?

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will permit me, I think every Member will understand that I do not agree to the half-and-half proposition.

Mr. JUUL. Why should the Federal Government pay any of it?

Mr. Sisson. I do not think it should, except for the Federal Government's activities here. The gentleman and I agree on that proposition absolutely. Congress passed a law some years ago, and it is incumbent upon us either to repeal the law or to carry it out.

Mr. JUUL. I do not want to take up the gentleman's time; but even if it is the law, it is not necessarily like the laws of the Medes and Persians, is it?

Mr. Sisson. It seems that it is. We have tried two or three times to pass a bill to annul that half-and-half arrangement, and we have passed it through this body, but when it went to another body it was hung up there and finally disagreed to. Once the House voted 2 to 1 in favor of abolishing the half-and-half proposition, and we got the bill into the other body, and there it was held up for quite a while, until we finally ceased to have conferences, and then the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Underwood] made a motion to refer the whole proposition to a joint commission of the two Houses. That joint commission was appointed, and those of us who wanted to abolish the half-and-half plan knew then that that was the burial ground of our attempts to abolish the half-and-half proposition, and our project was decently buried.

Mr. JUUL. I would like to get this straight. Suppose a side street here in Washington, with no Government property facing it, is to be paved. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that they put their hands into the Federal Treasury and pave that side street with Government money?

Mr. Sisson. They do.

Mr. JUUL. And you gentlemen have stood for it?

Mr. Sisson. I have not, so that the gentleman's comments do not in any way affect me. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a member of the subcommittee having charge of this bill, and as such member I endeavor to assist in making appropriations in accordance with the law. Wherever it is proposed to change the existing law I have always made it a rule to refer the matter to the proper committee or to call the attention of that committee to it. Under the rules of the House this committee can not legislate.

Mr. MEEKER. Of course the gentleman understands that the Federal Government does not even go half-and-half on the franchise. The people here do not vote.

Mr. Sisson. I must decline to yield for the purpose of going into that.

Now, there is one other matter that I want to call to your attention. Heretofore and at the present time the District of Columbia has its garbage cared for by contract. They let out a contract to the lowest bidder. The contract now for taking care of the garbage is \$69,000, and that bid expires on the 1st of July. They advertised for bids for the next year, as the law directs, and they first got a bid for \$133,000, which they rejected because it was too high. They then advertised again for bids to take care of the garbage, and the lowest bid they could get on the second advertisement, according to the testimony, was \$143,000. The man making the bid for \$143,000 accompanied his bid with a certified check for \$3,000. When the time came to enter into the contract, he declined to enter into the contract and forfeited the \$3,000.

The District Commissioners then made an effort to get bidders. They failed. The 1st of July is rapidly approaching. The garbage of the District would not be cared for unless we could get some legislation. This matter was called to the attention of the District legislative committee, and they reported a bill which was passed through the House recently.

Now, in accordance with the provisions of that bill—I do not know, but I presume that the bill will pass the Senate today or to-morrow; my information is that the bill was reported without amendment from the legislative committee of the Senate—in accordance with the provisions of that bill we have put in an item in this bill prepared by the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and that is made immediately available for the purpose of taking care of the garbage.

It is not necessary for me to explain to you the alternative propositions in that bill, because all the Members of the House were here and heard that discussion at some length. But that item is also in the bill, and will be on its face a considerable increase; it does not matter whether we adopt one or the other of the three propositions. When we reach that item, if there is any controversy about it, I will take time to explain it.

Your committee gave to the school board 146 new teachers. While this seems to be, and is, a very great increase in the number of teachers, the population of the District of Columbia has increased remarkably since the outbreak of the war. The majority of the schools are very much overcrowded, as shown

by the testimony before your committee. We went as carefully as we could over the matter, taking the number of children that a teacher ought to have, and, as nearly as we could, estimated the number of additional teachers; and we gave the 146 additional teachers with the understanding with the Board of Education and the superintendent of schools that no additional teachers should be employed who were not actually needed. It was very difficult for your subcommittee to determine with absolute exactitude just how many additional teachers would be needed.

We made some investigation of the salaries of the teachers and some little examination into the amount paid to teachers in other cities of about the size of Washington. In the higher-grade places we found that the teachers here are paid more than they are paid in the majority of cities, but in the lower grades, while the salaries are as much as they are in some cities, they are less than in some places. For example, a teacher getting \$50 a month, or \$600 a year, would be getting just about what she would get in the majority of cities like Louisville, St. Louis, and cities of that character; but in those cities we found that the kindergarten teachers and some of the teachers of the lower grades were paid higher salaries than were paid to teachers in higher grades. Speaking for myself, I think this is wise, and I think I also speak the sentiment to a large extent of the subcommittee that investigated this matter. We felt that the teachers of the lower grades, selected for their knowledge of child life, teachers capacitated to take care of little children and to start them in the lower grades, should be paid higher salaries than those in the higher grades, where the children are old enough to be able to help themselves to some extent.

We thought if there should be a difference, and if we were making the school laws and had to do with the rearrangement of the law, we would make the salaries in those lower grades higher. But we could not go fairly into this matter, because if you will examine the longevity law of the District of Columbia my friends on the committee will bear me out in the statement that it is one of those mysteries which even the experts themselves can not tell you about, as to the exact amount that will be needed to pay the expenses of the public schools, because you can not tell the number of resignations, you can not tell the number of deaths, and so on, so that if you can come within \$25,000 or \$30,000 of estimating what will be necessary under that longevity arrangement you will do pretty well. So in increasing the salaries your subcommittee took the lower-grade teachers, and if you will look at the report you will find the exact number of teachers whose salaries we increased. The amount necessary to pay for the increased number of teachers is \$127,250 and the amount necessary to pay the increase of salaries is \$124,100. Now, you can not grant a small increase in the lower grades without running up into figures pretty rapidly, because in the lower grades we increase the salaries of 936 teachers; in class 3, 498; in class 2, 352; and in class 1, 86.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. A great deal of this is a revelation to me.

Mr. Sisson. It is to a great many Members.

Mr. JUUL. While the Government performs a great many functions, yet the United States Government as a Government has no children. Now, can the gentleman see any reason why the people in this city, having \$100,000,000 or \$125,000,000 poured in here by the National Government from all the States of the Union—can the gentleman give me any reason why the National Government should assist in paying the cost of educating the children in the city of Washington?

Mr. Sisson. I will say to the gentleman that personally—I do not want to embarrass any member of the committee—but expressing my own view, personally I see no reason why they should do it. In order that I may get that matter behind me, let me state my position in relation to taxation in the District of Columbia, then the gentleman will understand my position and will see that he and I do not disagree as to the principle.

Mr. JUUL. The position the gentleman occupies is as an appropriator of public money; and is the law such that it is compulsory—

Mr. Sisson. Absolutely.

Mr. JUUL (continuing). To appropriate money in the bill so as to assess the citizens of the United States in a matter which in decency the residents of the District ought to pay themselves?

Mr. Sisson. We are complying with the law.

Mr. JUUL. I do not want to get into an argument with the gentleman—

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I have stated my position, and I hope it will satisfy the gentleman. I can not go into the reasons of bad laws that we have in the District of Columbia. If I could write the law, I would provide a reasonable rate of taxation on a reasonable assessment of property of all the people of the District of Columbia. Then I would collect those taxes and put them into the Treasury; and when we appropriated money out of the Federal Treasury we would appropriate the balance needed. There is going to be a surplus of about \$2,000,000 if we get the bill through as it is written—\$1,900,000 left over in the District treasury. If I could have my way about it, I would use that million and odd thousand dollars in paying the expenses of this bill and then let the balance of the money necessary to pay the expenses of the bill be paid out of the Federal Treasury, because manifestly under the Government supervision there are many things that this District ought not to pay and nobody wants them to pay. They are governmental activities. Nobody wants the District of Columbia, for example, to pave the streets and sidewalks around Government property. The Government ought to pay something. Another thing: In laying out the city of Washington, it was laid out on a more magnificent scale than are commercial cities in other States. It is true the people bought property after the streets were laid out. I have stated to my friend what could be done and what in the nature of things is a feasible thing to do.

Now, coming back to the teachers. We give the teachers receiving \$500 an increase of salary to \$750; class 2, receiving \$600, to \$750; and those receiving \$650 were given \$750. Now, in addition to that, they will get the \$120 increase, making a total of \$870 as the lowest-paid teacher in the District of Columbia. Your subcommittee thought that was a fair increase in salary, and it is very much higher than the average of that paid by any city I know of in the United States.

There is another matter to which I wish to call your attention in reference to school activities. While we did not give all the amount of money the District Commissioners asked for, we gave \$12,900 for dental clinics, which was perhaps less than half of what they asked for.

Another new departure to which I call the attention of the committee is the creation of the two-platoon system in the fire companies.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. My information is that the average school building is very much congested now with children. How generally are the portable houses going to be used?

Mr. Sisson. We gave them all that they asked for. It is quite a long story, but I will say that we had the board of education submit to us a statement as to the number of children in each school and the number that could not be accommodated, and we took the number to be accommodated in each portable school building and gave them enough money to build portable buildings to take care of the surplus children.

Mr. MAPES. So next year you estimate that all the children in the District will be taken care of?

Mr. Sisson. Absolutely, if the figures and estimates are correct. We make the fund immediately available, so that the portable buildings can be provided. Of course, that cuts out \$2,000,000 for school buildings that we had in the bill.

Mr. MAPES. How many school children can be accommodated in the portable buildings?

Mr. Sisson. From recollection, I think something like 200 portable buildings, and you can estimate 40 children to a school building, so that gives about 8,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Does the gentleman mean to say that this bill adds 200 schools to the number already existing?

Mr. Sisson. Oh, no; not 200 schools; nothing like that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Already there are 300 school-houses in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will understand, what they call a portable building is a little room. For example, at one of these schools where they need an eight-room addition, they will have three or four of these little portable buildings. They have that all outlined here in the testimony. If the gentleman will turn to page 589 of the hearings he will find that the John Eaton School, the Tennallytown School, the Petworth School, and so on, are all taken up, and a number of pages of testimony are devoted to the number of children at each of these buildings, and the number of rooms they would need. When you say you want an eight-room addition to a school building, that means that you practically have eight portable school buildings there, because each portable building is a unit. Therefore you would

have eight portable buildings. We were confronted with this proposition: Either the children must go without education for the next year, because there is no place to house them, or we had to provide these temporary buildings. I will say that it did not satisfy the board of education nor the commissioners, and not a single member of your subcommittee was at all satisfied, but if we had appropriated over \$2,000,000, which would have been necessary, there would have been no certainty that we would have gotten one-half or even one-third of the space that the \$2,000,000 ought to buy. In addition to that, there is no certainty that any one of these buildings would have been put up, so it was either a portable building or let the children go without school facilities, and we adopted that alternative, although it is not a thing that we like to do.

Mr. MAPES. Does the bill provide for the increased number of teachers that it will be necessary to have?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Perhaps the gentleman made this clear; but in regard to the increase of salaries to the teachers, what would be the lowest salary paid to any teacher in the District?

Mr. SISSON. \$870.

Mr. MAPES. That is the basic salary of \$750 plus the \$120 increase?

Mr. SISSON. Yes. The lowest salary would be \$870. Calculate the longevity pay, and the gentleman will have to get that table to figure that out, and after a teacher has been here one year the lowest salary then paid to the second-year teacher would amount to about \$900.

Mr. MAPES. They get their longevity pay in addition to the \$870?

Mr. SISSON. That is the law; we could not change that. The next year they would get \$925, then \$950, \$975, and so on up to \$1,000. If we had increased arbitrarily a teacher's salary who had been in her fourth year to the \$1,000, that would give something like \$1,200 and odd, so your subcommittee endeavored to make the salary of the lower-grade teachers the same, and made it \$750 plus the \$120 and plus whatever longevity pay they may get.

I had just started to talk about the two-platoon system. The two-platoon system was gone into with a good deal of care by your subcommittee. It seems in most of the cities they are beginning to adopt the two-platoon system. When you consider the matter first, you would imagine it would take twice as many men to run a two-platoon system as a one-platoon system. That is not true. It takes about 30 per cent more men, and that is done by catching up the slack. For instance, for five days the firemen are on duty for 23 hours, and then they are off one whole day and then off a half. Therefore by catching up that slack and leaving one less man on duty at each fire house, by increasing the force in the District 144 men we are able to let every man spend every other night at home. He may not take his time in that way. He might take a week and spend that week at home at night, and the next week at the fire engine house at night. The testimony showed to your committee that many of these firemen would go home and see their children but once a week, and as one of them expressed it, some of their children hardly knew them. These men render splendid service and they did not ask for any additional salary at all. What they asked for was an opportunity to spend some time at home, and I do not believe that I am betraying anyone's confidence when I say that your subcommittee was unanimous in its report upon this proposition.

Now, by taking 144 men, officers and men, which is about 30 per cent increase over the present force, we are enabled to let the firemen stay at home one day 14 hours and on duty 10 hours. The next day it would be just the reverse, he would stay 14 hours at home and on duty 10 hours and the next day 10 hours at home and 14 on duty. Or you could adopt another plan, 8 hours, 12 hours, and 16 hours. That is, you have three shifts but by arranging the shifts so that they lap into each other you can arrange that a man shall be on duty 8 hours and off duty 12 hours, and the next week be off duty 16 and then go on duty 16 and off 8 and in that way you enable the force at all times to be full and yet enable the firemen to spend practically half their nights at home. So we gave them 144 additional firemen for that reason.

Now, I do not know that there is any other item in the bill to which I wish to call especial attention. We granted increases in some clerical services. For instance, the stenographers were getting, some of them, \$800 or \$900. Now, the Federal Government was paying very much more than this, \$1,500 some of them, and the District government was unable to keep any stenographers. Our own clerks get \$2,000, so your subcommittee recommended to the full committee and to the Congress that the

stenographers get a salary of about \$100 a month, about \$1,200. Now, that has been running through the bill generally—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think that a stenographer should get more than a school-teacher who helps to educate and train the children? I do not. There is not an occupation in the United States that is so important to the welfare of the United States as that of the teachers who instruct the children, and they are, as a class, among the poorest paid. They take the child at the formative age, when habits are in the formation—

Mr. SISSON. I will say to the gentleman I used to teach school myself, and my sympathies are with the school-teachers; but in my judgment when school-teaching gets to be a profession—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, will the gentleman permit an interruption—

Mr. SISSON. One moment; let me make this statement—where the individual engaged in the school work is making that a life work and not a stepping stone to something else, then the services rendered in every community in the United States would be such that in 30 years they would impress their value upon every community to that extent that the whole sentiment of the country would be for paying them wages that are comparable with the duties which they perform. What I mean is this: The teachers of the country could in one generation so impress themselves upon the country that their value would be apparent.

But it is utterly impossible for the District of Columbia to be put in the attitude of paying vastly more for school-teachers than is paid in any other portion of the country. Now, with this increase that this bill provides, the pay that the school-teachers will get is considerably greater than that paid in other communities and in other cities the size of Washington. Now, if there is an injustice done here, the injustice is done in the gentleman's State and in my State; it is done in every State in the Union; it is done by people who pay their own taxes; it is done by people who do their own voting in their own cities, towns, and villages. We are most liberal here, and, taking into consideration the fact that at this particular time it becomes our duty to try to conserve every possible dollar we can, in order that we may put every dollar we can in this war, your subcommittee did not grant increases in salary except where we felt an injustice would be done to an employee of the District of Columbia by virtue of the physical cost of food and the physical cost of living.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the indulgence of the Chair just a moment—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for—

Mr. SISSON. For five minutes. I really do not want any more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to talk for so long a time, and if the gentleman from Minnesota desires to use—

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking around for some of the gentlemen to whom I promised time, but I do not see them, and I have telephoned half a dozen—

Mr. SISSON. I have no objection to yielding if some gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the salary that a teacher receives in the District of Columbia the first year?

Mr. SISSON. Well, the teacher who is regularly employed the first year gets \$600.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is \$50 a month?

Mr. SISSON. Well, \$60 a month, because they work only 10 school months. They get \$60 a month, but it is practically like getting \$50 a month if the gentleman wants to put it that way.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, then, if he or she is very faithful and diligent the first year, how much do they get the second year?

Mr. SISSON. Now, you will have to get that table. I think the increase is \$25, maybe \$30.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A year?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What do they get the third year?

Mr. SISSON. Six hundred and fifty dollars, if I am correct about the longevity increase.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And what do they get the fourth year?

Mr. SISSON. Six hundred and seventy-five dollars and—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. When does it end?

Mr. SISSON. At the end of 10 years.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. How much do they get then?

Mr. SISSON. You can make the calculation yourself. Some of them get \$1,000—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the teacher begins at \$600 a year, and is faithful, and lives in the city of Washington, and pays the prices for edibles and other things that she has to pay here, at the end of 10 years she gets \$1,000. You are not expecting—

Mr. SISSON. I do not expect them to do anything. I do not want the gentleman to imagine that I am myself—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am taking the facts as the gentleman gives them.

Mr. SISSON. I have simply stated to the gentleman, and I state now, that this is what we have done and just what we believe is right, and no amount of cross-examination could in any way change my attitude toward the matter at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not expect to change the gentleman's views, but I am trying to get at the facts.

Mr. SISSON. Those are the facts. I have stated them to you.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman stated, as I understood him, that when the teachers indicated that they proposed to make teaching their profession—

Mr. SISSON. Not only here. I took the whole country.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am applying it to Washington. He said that then they would increase the wages. If they start in a profession that occupies 10 years before they get \$900, then at the end of 30 years the whole country would rise up and give them compensation that they can live on?

Mr. SISSON. Let me say this to the gentleman, that in my judgment the whole trouble about the school system in the District of Columbia is that it is too much inbred now. Under the longevity system it does not make any difference whether the teachers are efficient or inefficient. You keep them on, and the longer you keep them the more money they get. That ought not to be. There ought to be some elasticity, so that when a teacher shows fitness the teacher may be promoted in accordance with the service rendered, and not in accordance with the number of years of teaching.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. For fear that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have a misapprehension in reference to the minimum basic pay, they received, to start with, \$600, and we raised it to \$750, and the general increase would be \$870.

Mr. SISSON. If you add the general increase, it would be \$870.

Mr. LAZARO. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi this question. Is it not a fact that in a country like ours, where the people rule, a school-teacher should be one of the best-posted and one of the best-paid men in the land?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SISSON. Unless the gentleman from Minnesota will indicate some—

Mr. DAVIS. Do you not think that we had better rise now?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the motion that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11692, making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that perhaps I myself have occupied too much time in my remarks, but I ask unanimous consent that the general debate upon this bill be limited to—

Mr. DAVIS. I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that his statement was so beneficial that we will not consider that he took too long. I suggest that he retain two hours.

Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to five hours additional, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two hours by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to five hours additional to what has already been had, three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] and two by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GARNER. Not to exceed five hours.

The SPEAKER. Yes; not to exceed five hours. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MIE URATAKE (H. DOC. NO. 107).

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of War, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 27, 1918.

To the SPEAKER HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to invite attention to the communication from this department, dated February 19, 1916, transmitting a petition of Mie Uratake, widow of Torabachi Uratake, for indemnity on account of the killing of her husband, a Japanese subject, by Private India Adams, Company K, Twenty-fifth Infantry, at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, November 25, 1915. There was also transmitted, in addition to other papers, a copy of the court-martial record of the trial and conviction of Private Adams upon a charge of manslaughter in that he "did, through negligence and carelessness in the handling of his rifle, shoot and kill T. Uratake, a Japanese." The record shows that petition and other papers were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. No. 785, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), and that subsequently a bill was introduced (H. R. 19899) for the relief of Mrs. Uratake; but apparently no further action has been taken. This office has been informed by the Secretary of State that that department has written a letter, dated March 26, 1918, to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, urging the enactment of the desired legislation in this case and inviting attention to the fact that that department is informed that Mrs. Uratake is in straitened circumstances, and also to the fact that the Japanese ambassador at this Capital has again made inquiry concerning the status of the matter.

It is the view of this department that this is a case in which it would be proper for Congress to grant the relief requested, and it is therefore recommended that the necessary legislation to this end be enacted. In this connection reference is made to a similar recommendation made in the case of Tatsuji Saito, a Japanese subject, who was killed, presumably by American soldiers, at Camp San Geronimo, Mex., May 25, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 194, 65th Cong., 1st sess.).

Respectfully,

BENEDICT CROWELL,
Acting Secretary of War.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. May I ask what is the date of the letter referred to the Committee on Military Affairs?

The SPEAKER. March 26. This was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday for to-morrow be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 1, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting Twelfth Annual Report of the American Red Cross (H. Doc. No. 2131, 64th Cong., 2d sess.), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from Committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4283) authorizing the donation of the land and building at Kennebunkport, Me., known as the old customhouse, to the town of Kennebunkport, Me., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 528), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7225) providing for the transfer to the custody

and control of the War Department property in San Francisco, Cal., known as the old Subtreasury property, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 529), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10663) to convey a strip of land on the site of the Federal building at Princeton, Ind., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 530), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3134) to regulate the interstate transportation of immature calves, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 531), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9544) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Ollis, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HADLEY: A bill (H. R. 11824) providing for an examination and preliminary survey of the watershed of the Skagit River, in the State of Washington, with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11825) providing for an examination and preliminary survey of the watershed of the Nooksack River and the North Fork, South Fork, and Middle Fork thereof, in the State of Washington, with a view to the control of the floods of said river and forks; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11826) granting the consent of Congress to the Sonoma Land Co., a corporation, to construct a bridge across Second Napa Slough; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAIGE: Resolution (H. Res. 331) directing the Clerk of the House to post conspicuously in the House wing of the Capitol and in the House Office Building notices of committee hearings in advance thereof; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 332) relating to the smoke nuisance in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWIFT: Resolution (H. Res. 333) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department to audit certain accounts and expenditures of the War Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

By Mr. SNYDER: Resolution (H. Res. 334) transferring jurisdiction of Indian reservations in the State of New York, not now specifically assumed by the Government, to the State of New York; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. POUL: Resolution (H. Res. 335) providing for the consideration of House bill 8938; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11827) granting an increase of pension to Levi Ritter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 11828) granting an increase of pension to William Schooley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 11829) granting a pension to Charles Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 11830) granting an increase of pension to George W. Vawn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 11831) granting a pension to John N. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11832) granting a pension to Charles D. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 11833) for the relief of Seth J. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11834) for the relief of William Henry Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11835) for the relief of Jimmie Lou Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11836) for the relief of Mary Holloman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUNN: A bill (H. R. 11837) granting a pension to Mary H. McCahan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 11838) granting a pension to Victor A. Benson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11839) granting a pension to George W. Weeks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 11840) granting a pension to Eugenie Schottmueller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 11841) granting a pension to Hugh Mackay; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 11842) granting a pension to Ella Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 11843) granting an increase of pension to John Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11844) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11845) granting an increase of pension to William Burch, alias A. M. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11846) granting an increase of pension to William Kildow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of members of the Phenix Farm Club, Walnut Grove, Mo., asking that farmers be assured a reasonable profit above cost of production; also, petition of lay inspectors, grades 1 and 2, station at St. Joseph, Mo., asking increase in salary; also, a resolution of the Southwestern Millers' League, indorsing House bill 10957, establishing standards of weights and measures for flour, meal, and commercial feeding stuff; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), resolution of the Independent Order of Foresters, Highlandtown, Md., pledging loyalty to the President in the prosecution of the war; also, a resolution of the Board of Directors of the School District of St. Joseph, Mo., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the First Baptist Church, Enterprise, Oreg., urging war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), resolution of the National Dairy Conference, demanding the repeal of the second-class postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of Local No. 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, favoring repeal of second-class postage provisions of war-revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), memorial of Washington (D. C.) Central Labor Union, against profiteering in rents in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), memorial of Roger Casement Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Boston, Mass., against conscription in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Resolution of the Grand Commandery of the Knights Templar of California, unanimously opposing peace without victory and pledging support to the Government, the cause, and the flag until the war is won; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolutions of Elk Grove (Cal.) American League, pledging fealty to the Government and favoring priority to war legislation; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Central Federated Union of Greater New York and Vicinity and of the Board of Directors of the Society of American Dramatists and Composers, urging the repeal of the zone system as applied to second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Patriotic resolutions adopted by the Grand Commandery of the Knights Templar of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 7448, granting pension to Riley R. Zerbe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of the bill for the relief of Luther Detwiler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 8044, granting pension to Mrs. Mary E. Roland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Lawrenceville, Ill., urging repeal of increased rate of postage on periodicals; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FREAR: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Northwestern Wisconsin Buttermakers' Association, protesting against the zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Northwest Wisconsin Buttermakers' Association, protesting against lowering tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of Trenton Chamber of Commerce, of Trenton, N. J.; the Mansfield Tire & Rubber Co., of Mansfield, Ohio; National Implement & Vehicle Association, of Chicago, Ill.; the Lombard Woman's Club, of Lombard, Ill.; L. M. Mason, of Streator, Ill.; Channing Pollock, of New York City; the faculty of Iowa Wesleyan College, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa; the faculty of Lake Erie College, of Painesville, Ohio; the Wednesday Morning Club, of Cranford, N. J.; the Illinois State Court of the Guardians of Liberty, and Miss Lydia Strawn, of Ottawa, Ill., asking for the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: Petition of the Illinois Conference of the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod, representing a membership of about 65,000 members, for the prohibition of the liquor traffic as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 211, Moline, Ill., United Association of Plumbers and Steam Fitters of the United States, that Thomas Mooney and his associates be set free by May 1, 1918; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the Minch & Eisenberry Co., Baltimore, Md., opposing the passage of Senate bill 3076 and House bill 9863, relating to use of prison labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Smith, Dixon Co., urging the repeal of that part of the war-revenue act dealing with second-class postage rates; also petitions of J. F. Durbin & Co. and the Kennedy Foundry Co., favoring partial payment of income and excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Baltimore Typographical Union, No. 12, favoring passage of House bill 8702, for increase in pay of certain employees in Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Baltimore Belting Co., opposing an amendment to the food-control act to include hides and leather; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. L. Perkins, Baltimore, Md., protesting against the passage of House bill 5712, pertaining to the circulation of certain fraternal matter in the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of the board of directors of the Women's City Club, of New York, and a telegram from Annie G. Lyle, M. D., San Francisco, Cal., urging legislation to secure military rank for American Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter from the students and faculty of the Siskiyou Union High School, protesting against the zone system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRONG: Petition of citizens of Corsica and vicinity, and of Joseph Somerville and other citizens of East Brady and vicinity, State of Pennsylvania, protesting against zone rate of postage on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of the Society of Illustrators of America, asking repeal of zone postage rates for second-class matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 1, 1918.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 30, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Dillingham	Gronna	Jones, Wash.
Beckham	Fall	Guion	Kellogg
Brandagee	Fernald	Hale	Kirby
Calder	Fletcher	Harding	Knox
Culberson	France	Hardwick	Lenroot
Cummins	Frelinghuysen	Henderson	Lodge
Curtis	Gallinger	Johnson, Cal.	McCumber

McKellar
McLean
McNary
Martin
Myers
Nelson
New
Nugent

Pittman
Poindexter
Pomerene
Ransdell
Saulsbury
Shafroth
Sheppard
Sherman

Smith, Md.
Smoot
Sterling
Sutherland
Swanson
Thomas
Thompson
Tillman

Townsend
Trammell
Underwood
Vardaman
Wadsworth
Walsh
Williams

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to state that my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], is detained by illness.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON], who is engaged in the liberty-loan campaign.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, transmitting a resolution favoring legislation to make available at the earliest possible date the water powers of the country, together with a tabulation of votes cast by commercial and trade organizations regarding the principles of water-power legislation, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3803) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States in connection with or incidental to the prosecution of the war.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. KAHN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the life, character, and public services of Hon. CYRUS A. SULLOWAY, late a Representative from the State of New Hampshire.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of the Publishers' Association of New York City, N. Y., praying for the postponement of the operation of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the American Defense Society of the State of New York, praying for legislation to punish persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities, or who interfere with the prosecution of the war, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the Progressive Women's League of Hartford, Conn., and of the Equal Franchise League of New Milford, Conn., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., praying for the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry rural mail carriers of Bridgeport, Stamford, New Britain, Watertown, Norwich, Windsor, and Somers, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for an increase in the salaries of rural mail carriers, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, in the State of Minnesota, praying for an increase in the salaries of rural mail carriers, which were ordered to lie on the table.